



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

AH 6C1Z

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY



From the collection
of the
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL
SOCIETY



THE
CHRISTIAN REPOSITORY,

DEVOTED, PRINCIPALLY, TO
**DOCTRINE, MORALITY, AND RELIGIOUS
INTELLIGENCE.**

BY SAMUEL C. LOVELAND.

In my Father's house are many mansions.—JESUS.

VOL. IV.

WOODSTOCK :
PRINTED BY DAVID WATSON.
1824.

9830
100-3

Period.

397

V. 4

1824

CONTENTS.

Athanasian Creed	31
Attempt at conversion	35
A Hint to Young Preachers	252
Authors of the Appeal	39
Anecdote	45
A poem on the shortness and uncertainty of life	96
A Reverend Gambler	218
An Invocation to the Deity	244
Biblical criticism	69, 71
Beware of enthusiasm	229
Calvin's five points	37
Character of Mr. Elhanan Winchester	41
Christ in the form of God	162
Church establishments	219
Dissertations on future punishment	9, 63, 129, 177, 281
Dedication and Installation	47
Drunkenness	183
Dr. Watts' Address	211
Doctrine of total depravity	16
Extract from a Sermon on Total Depravity, by Rev. John Clarke	254
Extract from the Proceedings of the Northern Associ- ation of Universalists	288
Extract of a letter from Br. M. Needham	44
do. do. Br. E. Turner	75
From William Worrall, pastor of the Universalist church, John-street, Glasgow, to Mr. Henry Fitz, Editor of the Gospel Herald, New-York	40
God's will	92
General Epistle	188, 205
Heathen Mythology! Purgatory!	44
Ingratitude	145
Lines on the death of Mr. U. S.	48
Letter to the Editor on the faith of the ancient fathers	138
Miscellaneous	45, 93, 145, 193, 236, 290
Minutes of the Southern Association of Universalists	83
Minutes of the Proceedings of the General Convention	184

Milton on Heresy	2
Notice—by request	1
Notice to the public	1
News from Scotland	2
Obituary	48, 94, 143, 195, 239, 2
On universal salvation	1
Orthodoxy enraged	1
On judging justly	1
Passages of Scripture in favor of universal salvation	168, 2
Poetry	2
Questions by a Roman Catholic to a Universalist, with answers	2
Queen Mary's Letter to the Lord Chandois, ordering the manner of Bishop Hooper's execution	2
Reason and Religion	
Remarks on the sentiments of Hopkinsians	11
Remarks	124, 170, 19
Religious controversy between a Congregationalist and a Universalist	171, 2
Sermon	1, 49, 97, 149, 197, 2
Sentiments of Hopkinsians	5
Sketch of the Life of John Wickliff	10
Southern Association of Universalists	20
Statements	28
Superstition and Liberality contrasted	25
To the Reader	
The discontented Pendulum	2
The broken agreement of the Junior Editors of the Universalist Magazine and the Authors of the Appeal to the public	75
The Universalists contend among themselves	76
The Grave of Lazarus	78
The public censure of the Southern Association	85
The Infant called away	95
The 137th Psalm paraphrased	144
Universalism	190
Western Association	143
What's this world to me?	292
Was Jesus Christ a literal Sacrifice?	262

CHRISTIAN REPOSITORY.

No. 1.

JUNE, 1823.

Vol. IV.

TO THE READER.

Our subscribers who have read the Christian Repository from its commencement, need no description of the object and plan of the work. Others may, perhaps, wish some general outlines of what they may expect its pages will afford. In compliance with such desires, the Editor offers these remarks. Whatever is calculated to encourage cool and dispassionate investigation, to promote the knowledge of the holy scriptures, and the pure principles of the religion of Jesus in the heart, he would embrace with the pure zeal of a real disciple, and as a faithful servant of Christ, offer to his readers. Perfection he does not promise. Nor can he flatter himself or his readers that he shall be able always to meet their expectations. The prepossessions of opinion are too various and too strongly fixed in the minds of many, to be accommodated by the labors of a single individual who is exposed to like unfavorable biasses, and similar imbecilities that are common to his readers. But it is not difficult for us to aim at improvement, and in such labors we may look for a blessing from our heavenly Parent.

The matter contained in the Christian Repository is calculated to be doctrinal, practical, and historical. The most important news of transactions in the Universalist connexion, such as proceedings of general meetings, rise and prosperity of societies, &c. will occupy a portion of its pages. In this department, the Editor will not confine himself to the Universal-

ists, but shall give place to interesting transactions among other denominations. He does not calculate wholly on original matter, tho a considerable portion from his own pen and others, will generally be original. And he here takes an opportunity to acknowledge the valuable productions which his brethren have afforded him, and to solicit a continuance of their favors. Those pieces will be understood to be editorial, where no credit is given.

SERMON, NO. X.

John x. 16. *And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.*

The term *other* evidently refers to sheep that had before been made the subject of discourse, and is used to represent a distinct portion of our Savior's property. The word *sheep* is figurative. It is designed to apply to mankind, according to their different relations and characters. And the only question that would naturally arise in this place, is, whether this word may be applied to a portion or the whole of mankind, to the virtuous or vicious, or to both. That it may apply to different classes is indisputable, from the consideration that Christ discourses of sheep, and then adds, "I have *other* sheep."

Before we can safely determine what is meant by the *other sheep*, mentioned in our text, we shall do well to consider the allusion to what was offered before. This we have in the commencement of the chapter, in the parable of the shepherd and the sheep. In the 9th verse he explains *himself* to be *the door*; and in the 11th, the *good shepherd*. The character of the sheep are described by their obedience. "When he putteth forth his own sheep he goeth before them,

and the sheep follow him, for they know his voice. He calleth his own sheep by name and leadeth them out. And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him; for they know not the voice of strangers."

From this description, we perceive that the sheep cannot be described by national character, nor known by national boundaries. If we say the sheep in this parable means the Jews, the description does not suit their character. They neither know the voice of the true shepherd, nor follow him. Indeed, he testifies to a number of them, "Ye are not of my sheep as I said unto you, my sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me." Should we consider these sheep as applying indiscriminately to the Gentiles, we should remain in equal difficulty; for it was never yet altogether true of them, that they heard and obeyed the voice of this great and faithful Shepherd.

There is no decision on this point that appears more rational, than to consider Christ as speaking of *believers*. The description well comports with their character. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." *Faith* comes by *hearing*, and hearing by the word of God. Jesus calls; the believer hears and knows his voice. All believers whose faith works by love and purifies the heart, follow their shepherd. They distinguish his voice from the voice of strangers, because they are acquainted with it. These believers could then be but a few, selected from the Jewish nation, altho it is beyond a doubt, they comprehended all that then believed in him.

Allowing these conclusions to be just, the way is now prepared to consider more particularly the subject matter of our text. "And other sheep I have," says the Redeemer.—Ah, what other sheep? Any other than believers? Yes. "And other sheep I have, which are not of *this* fold." If believers were included in the parable, they could not be included here. And if some believers were there meant, it is evident, all that were then believers, were meant. That unbe-

lievers were included in the text is plain from the description of their character. They "are not of this fold," implies they must be elsewhere. "Them also I must bring," shows that they were not brought, were unreconciled, and, consequently, unbelieving.

It is not from this description of character alone, that we are authorized to consider unbelievers a portion of Christ's property; but we find it maintained by the united testimony of many passages. The heathen which are given him for his inheritance, the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession, afford descriptions of such a character. If Christ tasted death for every man, if he gave himself a ransom for all, as the Scriptures assert; unbelievers must certainly be included.

As we think it likely these ideas may be new to some of our readers, it may not be amiss to labor this part of our subject somewhat particularly. The term sheep is used as a figure to represent different characters, the wicked as well as the righteous. Where sheep and goats are mentioned in the 25th chapter of Matthew, sheep are used for the righteous only; being so called in the last verse, "*the righteous* into life eternal." When it is said, "All we like sheep have gone astray," sheep must mean the wicked; for these are the characters that go astray. When Christ said, "The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep," is it wrong to say, he meant all mankind? Is it not plain from other scriptures, that he died for all without exception? As we have it from the evident authority of two passages, that sheep is used as a figure for the wicked, there arises nothing, from this consideration, against the term being applied indiscriminately to all men. But in our text we apply it to unbelievers only, because believers had been before designated. Our Savior, no doubt, had his eye upon the large field of the Gentile world, the "every creature" to whom he commanded his disciples to preach the good tidings of the gospel. The two classes of men, *the sheep* in the parable, and the *other sheep*, spoken of in our text,

include, according to the faith of all denominations of christians, the whole extent of the Savior's property. The point in which they differ, is concerning the proper number that belong to him. But tho this may be a point of difference, we cannot expect to profit by making it subject of warm contention.

As Christ has chosen, in this instance, the similitude of shepherd and sheep, to represent the relation between himself and mankind, we may expect to profit by considering a few analogies. Sheep were not anciently kept by the walls of enclosed fields, as at the present time; but by the immediate presence of the shepherd, who exercised his guardian care over them by night as well as day. This custom is mentioned in different parts of scripture, and is often noticed by ancient authors. When sheep are in an undomesticated state, it is not to be expected they will become tame from their own exertions, but from the exertions and care of their shepherd. So with the great Shepherd that gave his life for the sheep; he came to seek and to save that which was lost. No domesticated sheep is unwillingly happy under the care of its shepherd, neither is it possible for men to be dragged to heaven by force. It seems a contradiction in terms that any being can be forced to be happy.

Christ speaks of his other sheep as not belonging to the fold that hear his voice and follow him, and says, "*Them also I must bring.*"—A very natural expression for a man speaking of his property; and implies that his ability in collecting and bringing them in, is naturally understood. Christ alludes to what he had done in bringing the sheep he then had in his fold by the little word, *also*. The bringing in of his other sheep he speaks of as an event then future, but which must in due time, be actually accomplished. Whenever we hear a man speaking of a certain business of his own, and saying, *This I must do*, we understand it to be his purpose, and that he is conscious of his ability to perform what he says. We learn that Christ on a certain occasion says, "All that the Father giveth

me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out; for I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." To his disciples he says, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." The very idea of his bringing in those who were then gathered in his fold, and who rejoiced to hear his voice and to follow him, was a bright sample of what he will do. But the manner in which the other sheep are to be brought in, we learn from the following expression, "*And they shall hear my voice.*"

We see by this expression that Christ adheres to the analogy between his similitude of shepherd and sheep, and the thing represented by them. A shepherd *calls* his sheep; and they learn to follow him. Jesus *calls* his people. "Come unto me," says he,—"learn of me, and I will give you rest."

With an eye on this circumstance, let us further view our subject through the medium of this similitude. When sheep are unacquainted with the voice of their shepherd, can they distinguish it from the voice of a stranger? And if, when the shepherd calls, the sheep attempt to run away, as wild sheep always will, what would a shepherd be likely to do? What would the faithful shepherd, who owns the sheep, be likely to do? To abandon them, and tell them, because they would not come, it was their own fault? It was no concern of his whether they were food for wolves, or a prey to the voracious tiger? Shepherds never talk like this. If one sheep out of a hundred was lost, it would be sought with anxiety and avidity; and when found, it would be brought in with joy. And does Jesus exercise less care over his people, than an ancient shepherd did over his flock? The good Shepherd that giveth his life for the sheep exercises a faithfulness, that is not to be exceeded by the faithfulness of those that watched their flocks by night. He careth for the sheep; for they are his; they are the purchase of his blood.

The common shepherd that undertakes to domesti-

ate his wild and timid sheep, is patient to call until they become acquainted with his voice. Tho they use the utmost of their power to escape him, he is earnest and vigilant in pursuing. Their mistaken fears, and exertions to elude him, will cost them pain and weariness; but will detract nothing from the zeal of this shepherd to obtain them. The reader will easily perceive, how these remarks apply to Christ and the people whom he came to save. The figure cannot but represent the image in living colors.

In the voice of Christ, the true Shepherd of the sheep, we may notice a few particulars.

1. His voice is the voice of *faithfulness*. "Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after." But Christ as a Son over his own house, whose house we are, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end. When men are fully persuaded that he who calls them is faithful, it affords a powerful incentive to attend to his voice. The faithfulness of Jesus is maintained by many considerations. He is the Son, and faithful as a son. Mankind are his possession, which idea, in men, would excite the principle of faithfulness. It affords an encouragement to men to put their trust in him, tho, possibly, this consideration may add nothing to the faithfulness of our Lord. Faithfulness in an earthly shepherd secures the peace and safety of their flock, and excites perseverance in bringing home the wandering sheep. Faithfulness in the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls, is calculated to confirm our confidence in him, and give us an assurance that what he has promised he will be careful and sure to perform.

2. His voice is the voice of *mercy*. This we may very nearly infer from the idea of his faithfulness. By the constancy and faithfulness of Jesus, we learn that he is merciful. The sinner may suppose him an enemy because himself is wicked, but will learn in due time that we have a merciful and faithful high Priest, who can have compassion on the ignorant and

those who are out of the way. It is by a constant voice of mercy that the timid flocks learn to trust and follow their shepherd.

3. The voice of Christ is the voice of love. This is the grand principle by which he draws his people to himself. "The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." He was devoted to their service here, and to crucifixion, in death for their sakes. He is the propitiation for their sins—for the sins of the whole world. "Greater love," says Jesus, "hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." But Jesus laid down his life for his *enemies*. "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life."

4. The voice of Christ is the voice of truth. This is an essential property. Wherever there is a distrust in the character of a shepherd, his flock cannot feel safe in his care. The same is equally true of man as he stands in relation to his Redeemer. It is through the medium of truth that they are to come to the knowledge of him. And it is worthy of notice in this place, that our Savior expressed a particular concern that his people should know the truth. In praying for his disciples, he says, "Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth." Again, on another occasion, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." That policy among men, that hides any gospel truth from the people, or attempts to hide it, under any specious pretext whatever, we have no reason to believe will ever be countenanced by the true Shepherd that gave his life for the sheep. He never scrupled to inform his disciples of the calami-

ties or troubles that would befall them, nor did he fear the reproach of the enemy when he prophesied of a declension from the faith. "Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold." Experience and facts have long since proved this to be true; but it is what many false pretenders to a heavenly mission, would hardly be willing to own of their followers; much less voluntarily to predict.

The concluding part of our subject predicts a most happy result, *And there shall be one fold and one shepherd.* Hireling shepherds are not always to cheat the flock of the Savior's purchase, and leave them to the ravages of wolves. Their wanderings upon the mountains will cease, and their weariness in the valleys. Kept where God appoints salvation for walls and bulwarks, there will be no thief or robber to climb up another way, to terrify, rob, or spoil the flock. Now, folds are many; but then there shall be **ONE** fold. Shepherds are now numerous and much divided in their doctrines and methods of instruction; but the divisions must be dropped when their offices end and unite, in the office of the "one Shepherd." Now, perhaps, we behold a little flock that hear the voice of their Shepherd and follow him. Let us not fear. "Other sheep," says Christ, "I have, which are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one Shepherd."

DISSERTATIONS ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT. NO. 1.

The subject of future punishment is made at this day, by many writers in periodical works, a disputable question. We do not wonder that it is considered a matter of interest to mankind, but much lament that any thing should arise in controversies on this subject which is calculated to alienate the feelings of a brother. Our readers will undoubtedly be willing to receive a few dissertations on this subject of future punishment, in which we do not invite controversy; but calculate to exhibit our views and arguments upon

it. It is hoped those of our brethren in the common faith of universal salvation, who are opposed to our views, and disposed to pronounce them the relics of popery or paganism, will have patience to bear with us, in our labors; altho they may find us somewhat different from their wishes. We suggest this thought because we are sensible that opposing prejudices are calculated to feed unfavorable passions; and because we are sensible from a consciousness of our own failings, that we are liable to err.

It is worthy of notice in this place that the Scriptures were not written in a systematic form. Many things are barely alluded to, as taken for granted, because few or no people disbelieved them. Other things were often repeated in strong and unambiguous terms. Some things are difficult to understand, because there is in them an allusion to events or circumstances with which we are little, or not at all, acquainted. We are, therefore, to understand the scriptures, not by looking for a system, the component parts of which are arranged in methodical order, but by examining their expressions, allusions, and the circumstances and occasions to which they allude and of which they treat.

On the subject of punishment beyond this life, we think we may take for granted, that it has been the general sentiment of mankind, so far as we can ascertain, from very remote antiquity. The Jews of the present day are said to believe the doctrine; but think this punishment will be extended to an endless duration, only to a few, who are the most incorrigible sinners. It is generally thought the Jewish religion has received but very little alteration since the destruction of their capital city. The Pharisees of our Savior's day who constituted a large and popular sect of that age and nation, were believers of this doctrine. From the common opinion of future punishment among the Jews and Samaritans of our Savior's day, we know of no other exception than that of Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit. Our

readers, by this time, may begin to be surprised, and ask if these are our arguments to prove future punishment. We answer they are not; but still we think they have an importance that justly entitles them to a place here. If this doctrine be false, we should naturally expect that Christ would have offered something directly against it; or if he had not thought proper to have done this, he would have avoided the use of expressions, which are calculated by their natural import to support the doctrine. We think it will not be denied that a number of passages, with comparatively few exceptions, have been understood by the christian world, to refer, and clearly to support, the belief of such a period. For instance, let us take the expression of our Lord, *For every idle word that men shall speak, they give an account thereof in the day of judgement.* These words are spoken without comment to a people who already believe in a future judgement and retribution, and were written as the standing testimony of our Savior for the benefit of their posterity, who would naturally interpret them according to these circumstances. It is a well known fact, that every man that means to be understood, calculates to adapt his language to the situation of his hearers in such a manner as to accommodate himself to their customs and usages. People seldom think when a man uses their language, that he means something very different, unless particularly instructed that such is his meaning, or, his known sentiments and mode of speaking suggest the idea. But we know not, that Jesus ever offered them any plainer language on this subject, than has reached our times. To bring this matter to ourselves, we think the public will bear us testimony, that our brethren who oppose our views on this subject, very seldom or never find occasion in their writings or sermons to mention such passages of scripture without a labored comment to show that they do not favor either future punishment, or the common doctrine of endless misery. Why is this? No doubt, because they suppose the public prejudices

are such that those texts cannot safely be adverted to without being misunderstood. Well, if the public are liable to be led astray by the natural import of such passages now, were they in a better situation in the days of Christ? Were they then so much nearer the faith of our brethren as to render such comments as they offer entirely useless?

When according to any system of doctrine many passages that are believed to be the inspired word, on all occasions whatever, are made of no other use, than barely to show that they do *not* mean what has generally been thought they *do* mean; it is at least a strong symptom of defect in that system. What was written aforetime, was written for our learning, and, of course, is capable of some other use than barely to receive from our labors a negative meaning.

If these suggestions be allowed, (as we think by impartial judges they will) it will clearly follow that this mode of treating such passages, as speak of *suffering, punishment, fear, &c.* has grown naturally from their theory.

The arguments which we have heretofore offered respecting the manner in which people would be likely to receive our Savior's meaning on this subject of future punishment, are equally applicable to the language of the Apostles. Should it be said that he did not then intend to be understood by the people of his age, as many things were then *hidden from the wise and prudent*, a relief on this part of the subject, would scarcely afford them any assistance on that of the Apostles. An attempt to extend this idea to them, and to say, they did not mean to be understood by their cotemporaries, would afford us ground to retort upon our brethren, and to say, it is a matter of doubt, whether they understand the subject any better, than those who had been deceived before. But we presume this ground will not be taken; because it would make the Apostles the instruments of deception, not to the world in general only, but to their immediate friends. It would rest upon the idea that God poured out his

holy spirit to deceive the world on this important subject.

If we were to state in a history, as the writer of the Acts of the Apostles did of Paul, that he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgement to come, or *future condemnation*, as the words may be rendered, should we not now be understood to speak of future punishment? And if this doctrine was generally believed in the Apostolic age, as undoubtedly it was, would they not be likely to understand him in the same way? Perhaps the opposing critic has just discerned that St. Paul might reason of judgement or condemnation to come, and reason *against* it; but it is hoped he will have the goodness to examine his lesson two words back, and consider whether he reasoned *against* righteousness and temperance! Remember, brother, the word *and* continues the sense.

We do not propose at this time to introduce many passages of scriptures, but reserve most of those we calculate to treat and bring forward to substantiate our views of this subject in future numbers. Our principal object in the present number is to offer to the consideration of our readers the relative connexion between the apostles' preaching and the common sentiments of their age; whether Christ and his apostles meant to deceive the people; and whether if their language is intelligible on this subject, it is such as men would be likely to use, who meant to deny the doctrine of future punishment. Is it such as our brethren generally use in their discourses and writings? The two passages which we have quoted we give as a specimen of many others. These we shall notice in future as we find occasion,

—

From the Christian Philanthropist.

REASON AND RELIGION,

Among the singular imaginations which have entered the minds of men, is that of exalting one of God's gifts, by undervaluing another, Reason and Religion,

infinitely the richest blessings which heaven has bestowed, have found some, in every age who have attempted to put them at war with each other; and who seem to have thought, that to place the former very low in the scale of worth, would best evince the high veneration in which they held the latter. That Reason is the gift of God, will not, we presume, be denied. Our faculties, whatever their character, are given by Him, "from whom cometh down every good and perfect gift:" and whether they are considered as calculated to enlighten or mislead, to exalt or debase, they must still be traced to the same supreme source. We presume it will also be granted, that Reason is, on the whole, a blessing. If not, it belongs to those who deny it, to tell us of what use Revelation would be without Reason: nay, they must tell us, how it could be known that that which pretended to be a Revelation, was really so; how indeed it could be proved that such a being as God existed. These are things, which we have been accustomed to regard as quite important to be known, before we begin to talk about Religion. For Religion, or rather the record which contains it, is something addressed to man as a rational, accountable being, and before any one sits down to examine this record, in order to be guided by its instructions, he must satisfy himself that it is, what it pretends to be, the true word of God. If he neglect to do this, upon what ground does he embrace one religion in preference to another? Why is he a Christian, rather than a Jew or a Pagan? Why does he not read the Koran, instead of the Bible? And why, when he has embraced Christianity, does he attach himself to some one of its numerous systems of belief, and consider all the rest as erroneous? How, we ask, putting the use and authority of Reason aside, are these things done? It cannot be answered that that religion or doctrine is preferred, which has a preponderance of evidence in its favor; for this would be to consult Reason, and to consult it largely too; nay, it would be, to allow it to sit in judgement upon

Revelation, and determine which, of all the systems which assume this high character, does in truth possess it, and is best entitled to unreserved confidence. Thus it is evident, and we shall do well always to bear it in mind, that Reason is, and must be our guide; and so soon as we cease to consult and obey its dictates, we cease to be moral, religious, accountable beings.

The provinces of Reason and Revelation are thus defined by Mr. Locke: "*Reason* is natural *Revelation*, whereby the eternal Father of light, and fountain of all knowledge, communicates to mankind that portion of truth which he has laid within the reach of their natural faculties; *Revelation* is natural *Reason*, enlarged by a new set of discoveries communicated by God immediately, which *Reason* vouches the truth of, by the testimony and proofs it gives that they come from God. So that he that takes away *Reason* to make way for *Revelation*, puts out the light of truth, and does much the same, as if he would persuade a man to put out his eyes, the better to receive the remote light of an invisible star by a telescope."—Thus did one of the greatest philosophers that the world has seen, regard this distinguished gift; and thus should we all regard it. Reason is always abused, when its possessors forget that it came from the same Being who has given them a Revelation; and that consequently these two instructors and guides cannot, in any fair way, be made to oppose each other. It is always abused, and its Author insulted, when it is represented as being, in its natural state, an unsafe and dangerous conductor; and when the fears and suspicions of men are awakened, and they are led to think, that what appears to their unbiassed judgement to be right, must for that very reason be wrong. Strange, that this faculty which allies us to the Father of our spirits, should be so ungratefully received, and so inconsistently treated: idolized when it serves our purpose, and trampled upon the moment it operates against us. Strange, that men should attempt to reason us out of

our reason ; and with the Bible in their hands, think to convince us, that religion is a very *unreasonable* thing. But singular as this conduct is, its cause is obvious. Men have thought that to undervalue and decry their natural powers, was to be humble. But no mistake can be greater or more dangerous. It is not humility to lay our imperfections and follies at the door of another. It is not humility to make poor Adam or any body else take the blame of our faults. True humility consists in sorrowing for something which we have done ourselves, and endeavoring to do better ; not in finding fault with that nature which God has given us, and tracing all our sins to some other cause than our own bad passions, the evil propensities which we ourselves have created. Thus, says the excellent Jeremy Taylor, "men are taught to say that every man sins in every action he does ; and this is one of the doctrines for the believing of which he shall be accounted a good man ; and upon this ground it is easy for men to allow themselves some sins, when in all cases and in every action it is unavoidable." Let us not be led away from the simplicity of "the truth as it is in Jesus," by such absurdities as these. We are surrounded by temptations, but none of them are greater than we can resist, because to him that asketh for strength, it will always be given. Let us then use to the best of our power all the means of improvement put within our reach, whether by Reason or Revelation, assured that we may safely measure our obligation and duty by our knowledge and capacity.

From the Unitarian Miscellany.

DOCTRINE OF TOTAL DEPRAVITY.

Of two strange facts in the history of the human mind, we know not at which to wonder the most ; whether at the intolerably absurd opinions which have been extensively embraced, or the real ingenuity which has

been perverted to defend them. On the one hand, we see the most stupid weakness; and on the other, an extraordinary power employed in supporting that very weakness and stupidity. If we were required to specify some remarkable instance of human folly, we should name some prevalent dogma of a corrupt religion; and if we were desired to bring forward a corresponding instance of mental acuteness, we should point to the skill, which had labored to prove that self-same folly to be Heavenly wisdom. Men give up their common sense, and then set out to persuade themselves, and convince others, that it is the most sensible thing which they could possibly do.

Take, for example, the doctrines of original sin, and total depravity. What extravagant systems have been constructed on these points; and what subtle disquisitions, and immense volumes, have been piled up, like walls, to fortify and guard them. How sorely the wise have been puzzled in attempting to discover why and how guilt and misery came into the world, without stopping once to consider that their introduction might be necessary to the perfection of a wise and general system; and how earnestly they have toiled to make it out that human nature was altogether vile, notwithstanding the good affections, dispositions, and actions, with which the world is full.

The true and simple, as well as the most natural and obvious account of original sin, we take to be this. Human nature is, and for the wisest purposes was intended to be, an imperfect nature. Now imperfection implies a necessary liability to sin; it supposes weakness and error, and a departure from the line of absolute rectitude. We must have been either *imperfect* or *perfect*; and it is pretty evident that we were not intended to be either angels or gods. We assert that an infant is pure and innocent, not because we believe its nature to be sinless, not because we believe it to be created without propensities to evil, but simply because those propensities have not yet been brought

into action by the thousand occasions of the world, and consequently the child has not actually sinned. His *nature* remains the same; it is human nature, and imperfect nature, and the nature with which God chose to endow him, and the nature which must lead him, if he lives long enough, to transgress, in a greater or less degree, the divine law. So it is in the case of our first parents. They were at first, indeed, upright and spotless, as an infant is, and in no other way. But on account of their *imperfect nature* they yielded to a temptation, and transgressed a command of their Maker. It is not so easy to tell, from the allegorical language of Scripture, what this transgression was; but whatever it might be, it was their first sin, or in a more technical language, their *fall*. We their descendants, sin, not because their particular sin is entailed upon us, but because we are created with the same nature that they were, and therefore cannot help sinning. What difficulty is there in all this?

If the old question be asked, why did not the Almighty create us perfect? it is sufficient for us to answer, that we are not of His counsel; and we trust that He knows, tho we do not. We believe his wisdom to be infinite, and are altogether content that he should guide and govern the world as he sees most fit.

As to the doctrine of total depravity, we hardly know in what words to express our sentiments concerning it. On two or three passages of Scripture, which have been so misinterpreted as to contradict its most obvious and explicit declarations, has been founded the wild and revolting doctrine, that human nature is entirely corrupt; and that every human being, until affected by a supernatural and mystical agency, is wholly incapable of any good, and is justly subject to the wrath of God, and the torments of hell, forever and ever. This is exactly the Calvinistic belief, and by no means so strongly expressed as by some of its own advocates. And what a belief it

is! And what will men not believe, and what will they not defend, when they can receive and support such a dogma as this.

That human nature is sinful, no one who is acquainted with human nature will deny. That there is transgression, and folly, and wickedness, and outrage, in the world, and in abundance too, no one who lives in the world, and marks its ways, can for a moment doubt. That there are crowds of evil desires and imaginations in the heart of man, no one who has lifted the veil from a brother's heart, or from his own, will think of questioning. But this is not *total depravity*; and the man who can look forth into society, and see virtue mitigating the influences of vice, justice repairing the injuries of violence, pity hanging on the footsteps of revenge, charity extending protection and aid to the desolate and oppressed; see, in short, the thousand good offices which are passing from hand to hand, and the thousand manifestations of good feeling which are flowing perpetually from breast to breast; and then with a grave face declare that our nature is utterly vile, and that, with the exception of a few who have the presumptuous superstition to imagine themselves the elect of God, every human being is wholly depraved and lost, the man who can do this, we say, must either be deficient in natural understanding, or he must have had that understanding wofully perverted by education and sophistry.

It is of no manner of use to tell us of the learned and ingenious books which have been written to demonstrate this doctrine, nor of the able and pious men who have thought proper to write them. We know perfectly well, that a plain man, unacquainted with metaphysical discussion, might be so bewildered by the reasonings of an author like Edwards, as to doubt whether he trod upon the earth, or was shone upon by the sun. But let us be informed in fair, honest words, what is meant by this phrase, *total depravity*, so that we may decide, and others may

decide, whether we are to adopt, or to reject and denounce it. If it means that there exists no human being who is without sin, and who does not frequently transgress the commandments of the Almighty; if it means that vice and atrocity may be met with in every corner of the earth, and that not a day goes by without a long account of disorders, follies and crimes; why then we are orthodox on this point ourselves, and have nothing further to say. But if it means, according to the plain signification of the words, that there is no good whatever, in "unregenerate" man, but that all his actions, all his affections, and all his thoughts, are thoroughly corrupt and evil; we have not the least hesitation in saying, that it stands for one of the most idle and perverse imaginations, which ever occupied the mind of man; and that fact, and observation, and experience, and feeling, and Heaven, and earth, cry out against it, and proclaim it false.

That such is the true meaning of the orthodox doctrine of total depravity, is incontrovertibly evident from the writings of those, who have hitherto been considered as standard authors on the subject. And where are we to obtain the true meaning of a doctrine, if not from those who broached, and who defend it? What can be plainer than the following passage from Edwards, which is only one out of five hundred to the same purpose? "*So long as men are in their natural state, they not only have no good thing; but it is impossible they should have, or do, any good thing.*" Now, that is the genuine Calvinistic doctrine; and if Edwards had been inconceivably more acute than he was, and had filled the world with his books, and had ranked on his side all the Assemblies that were ever called, all the Catechisms that were ever made, and all the Divines that ever lived, we would have spurned such a doctrine, as we spurn it now, for it is against reason, against nature, and against fact. All the arguments and authorities that could be named can be of no avail, so long as human nature, and the world, remain as they are.

Human nature, as we have said before, is an *imperfect nature*. And that is the plain and direct answer to all that may be written or said in favor of *total depravity*. If it is evident that we are not angels, it is equally evident that we are not fiends. We are endowed with capacities for good, and presented with means and opportunities of exercising and improving them, on the one hand; and we are incited by passions and surrounded with temptations, on the other. According to these differing principles and circumstances, our characters are moulded. The influence of both, on the lives of men, and the moral state of the world, is as manifest as the divided sway of light and darkness. It should be the endeavor of every one to cultivate and exercise his good dispositions, and subdue and eradicate those which are evil, with all possible diligence and care, for it is the great work of existence. The Gospel was revealed to direct and assist us in this work, by its motives and laws. Indeed, we can discern no other object in revelation; and on the supposition that all men are totally depraved, whatever may be their efforts, till a supernatural conversion, after which event they are perfectly holy, without a possibility of falling; on such a supposition as that, we say, we should have to study long, before we found out for what purpose a revelation could have been made. What a perverse folly it is, to maintain the doctrine of total depravity, or of absolute holiness, under any circumstances of human life, while it may be so expressly contradicted by any human heart, no matter in what breast, nor in what region of the earth, it is beating.

It is not our intention to enter into a detailed discussion of this doctrine. We have merely stated its broad opposition to all that we see, hear, feel, and know, of the nature of man; at the same time proposing the simple fact of the imperfection of that nature, as the true key to the whole subject. Our thoughts were suggested by the perusal of *A Postscript to the Second Series of Letters, addressed to Trinitarians*

and Calvinists, in Reply to the Remarks of Dr. Woods on those Letters. By HENRY WARE, D. D.

This Postscript, of forty-eight pages, is all that Dr. Ware has thought necessary to advance in answer to the last work of Dr. Woods. We consider the controversy as now fairly brought to a close. If the orthodox are satisfied with the management of their side of the question, we are entirely so with the manner in which our own has been conducted. The doctrines of Depravity, Election, and Atonement, have been discussed with ability and care on both sides; and we are willing to abide by the result on the minds of those who will candidly study what has been written.

Dr. Ware's Postscript is marked by the same characteristics which distinguish his two preceding pieces. It is temperate, perspicuous, forcible, and to the point. A considerable portion of it is taken up in replying to a charge of misrepresenting the views of the orthodox, on the subject of man's depravity. This is done by making quotations of the most explicit character, from standard orthodox writers, both of past and present times. Calvin, the Westminster divines, Gill, President Edwards, Thomas Scott, President Dwight, Fuller, Henry Martyn, and lastly, *Dr. Woods himself*, and the *Andover Creed*, are proved to have employed the identical words and phraseology, against which Dr. Woods is pleased to take such complaining exception. We cannot deny ourselves one extract from this part of the Postscript, relating to the language of the *Andover Creed*, which every instructor at the Andover Institution is obliged to subscribe, every five years. Dr. Woods had been offended by the use of the word *incapable*, as applied to man's power of doing good. After making some quotations from his antagonist's own writings, in which the incapacity of unregenerate man to think or do any good thing is clearly inferred, Dr. Ware proceeds:

"But besides this, there is an Instrument, which Dr. Woods has occasion to subscribe once in five years. As it was drawn

up within a few years for a very important purpose, and by men who cannot be suspected of willingly investing orthodoxy with false colors, in order to render it odious, they may be supposed to have used great deliberation, and care, and accuracy, in the statement of its doctrines. As Dr. Woods has twice at least, if not three times, declared it to express his faith by solemnly setting his name to it, we may reasonably consider it as expressing what he sincerely believes; as much so, as any thing that he has himself published.

"In that Instrument are contained the following passages:

"By nature every man is personally depraved, destitute of holiness, unlike and opposed to God, and, previously to the renewing agency of the divine spirit, all his moral actions are adverse to the character and glory of God; *being morally incapable of recovering the image of his Creator, which was lost in Adam*, every man is justly exposed to eternal damnation; so that except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God God of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity, elected some to everlasting life *no means whatever can change the heart of a sinner, and make it holy regeneration and sanctification are effects of the creating and renewing agency of the holy spirit.*"

"You will think it not a little singular that Dr. Woods should have so far forgotten himself, as to charge me so indignantly with misrepresenting the orthodox faith; when the very term, which he has marked, as one of the most offensive, is applied in precisely the same manner in the creed, which he has himself subscribed."

In the course of this controversy, a small anonymous pamphlet was published at Stockbridge, Massachusetts, entitled, *Remarks on the Calvinistic Doctrine of Depravity, with particular reference to Dr. Woods' late Defence of that Doctrine, in his answer to Dr. Ware's Letters. By a Unitarian of Berkshire.* It is not probable that many of our readers have met with this tract; and as it contains some thoughts, which, if they are not original, are expressed in a striking and original manner, we conceive it to be worthy of a particular notice, and think that a few extracts will be read with interest. The writer pays no attention to arrangement, and very little to style, but his remarks give proof of a vigorous and independent mind.

The following observations on the Calvinistic sub-
tlety, which would make a distinction between man
as a member of society, and as a subject of God's
moral government, are very much to the purpose.

"Dr. Woods observes, in the beginning of his work, that
'this controversy does not respect man as a member of domestic
or civil society, but as a member of God's moral govern-
ment.' As Calvinists understand the moral government of God,
it does not require, as its chief aim, the consecration of our
powers to the service of our fellow creatures, by the practice
of benevolence, justice, mercy, and truth; in other words, the
moral government of God does not respect man as a member of
domestic or civil society. An enemy would turn this declara-
tion of Dr. Woods to immense account. He would take it in
connection with the well known doctrines of Calvinists, and
show, that upon their principles, religion has nothing to do with
virtue, as that word is commonly understood, but terminates in
the love of sermons, sabbaths, and prayers. For ourselves we
shall only observe, that in order to prove the doctrine of de-
pravity, Calvinists have always adduced those actions which
respect man as a member of civil and domestic society, such as
malice, envy, fraud, and falsehood. And now they are to be
set out of the question, it being found that the greater part of
men really obey the laws of this world! Really, we know not
what we have to refute, nor how we can qualify ourselves for
a better world, but by faithfully and conscientiously discharg-
ing the duties of the present."

It is curious, that in arguing the total depravity of
man, from the vices of his character, and the bad pas-
sions of his nature, the Calvinists do not themselves
perceive the palpable fallacy of such a mode of rea-
soning. One would think that nothing but attachment
to a system could so blind them, that they should not
see that precisely the same course might be adopted,
on the other side, to prove from the good inclinations
and virtuous actions of men, their absolute perfection.
If a certain number of vices prove the one, a certain
number of virtues, by parity of reasoning, prove the
other. It is unfair to keep looking exclusively on
the bad qualities of human nature, without once turn-
ing an eye to its good ones; and it is the sheerest
sophistry to assert that sin and holiness are connect-

ed with different classes of relations, and that the latter does not signify an obedience to the same laws, of which the former is the transgression. On this point we would introduce a pertinent extract from the pamphlet before us.

"This is the practice of Dr. Woods. 'Every child of Adam,' says he, 'has sinned ;' and he requires no further evidence of the *depravity* and *corruption* of the human species. His very next words, in addition to those we have just quoted, are, '*moral depravity* is as universal as reason, or memory, or social affection, or pity, or any of the bodily appetites.' If these are his premises, we admit them. We admit, that sin, taken for a single act of transgression, is absolutely universal, and is therefore of the very nature of man. We affirm, also, that virtue, taken for a single act of obedience, is equally universal. But something more is necessary to constitute either the rectitude, or depravity, of individuals, or of mankind. This is a plain matter, and need not be urged. Let Dr. Woods tell us what it is that is as universal as memory or reason. Let him tell us whether it be single acts, or habitual and exclusive practices. We shall then be able to decide whether it can be called depravity,—that depravity which subjects us to the wrath and curse of God, and to all punishments in this world, and in the world to come. Let him tell us, moreover, whether it be single acts, or habits of injustice, malice, cruelty, fraud, and falsehood, that constitute his idea of depravity. It was these things, and things like these, that used to be urged by Calvinists against their opponents; but they now seem to be shifting the question."

The bare truth, separated from all metaphysical clothing, is this; that the Calvinists, overlooking every existing sign of virtue and happiness, assume as a fact, that there is nought but sin and misery in the *unregenerate* world, and then draw the sapient conclusion, that man is, by nature, totally depraved. And, as a defence of this strange position, they have adopted a supposed complete distinction between the nature, and the moral character, of man; as if the latter could be determined without the least reference to the former. Dr. Woods, in page 50 of his "Reply," in speaking of various senses in which the word *natural* is used, says, "it is *natural* for serpents to bite;

it is the *nature* of birds to fly ; of lions, to be carnivorous ; of fishes, to swim." He asks afterward, in page 53, "may it not be with our moral nature in this respect, as it is with the peculiar properties of an eagle, a serpent, or a lion, which have always been considered as existing radically in the original constitution of the animal, tho they begin to show themselves a considerable time after ?" This example our anonymous writer turns to good account.

"Human beings have a natural, before they have a moral character. A moral character is a character formed by designed and voluntary obedience or disobedience to a law,—to a law of which the good or evil, that constitute its reward or punishment, are subsequent to the act of obedience or transgression. Now, obedience or disobedience to such a law, will depend essentially upon the natural disposition of the subject before the law was made known. Dr. Woods declares that it is as natural for man to sin, as for serpents to bite, for birds to fly, for fishes to swim, or for lions to be carnivorous.

"Let us then suppose that serpents, birds, fishes, and lions, become moral agents, by receiving the gift of reason, their natures in other respects remaining precisely the same. Having thus become moral agents, suppose them to receive a law to the following effect ;

"Birds shall not fly, fishes shall not swim, and lions shall not eat flesh, upon pain of eternal misery. Fishes shall, moreover, live in the air, and birds in the water ; and if either of them indulge an inclination to return to their natural element, they shall be subjected to the eternal wrath and curse of him who gave them this law." We shall say nothing of the utter cruelty of such commands. That consideration belongs to another part of our argument. When those animals have received the gift of reason, and along with reason, the laws above mentioned, they are totally depraved by nature. They have natural and invincible propensities, that must never in any case be indulged ; which is not the case with any natural propensities of man ; yet, this original, absolute, constant, and universal repugnance, between inclination and law, can alone constitute the natural depravity of any being whatever.

"Now, those animals, in their two different states, will represent children and men. They will represent children, before they have received the use of reason, and men, after they have the use of that faculty, together with the supposed commands. Their first is a natural, their second is a moral character. And these two characters, according to Dr. Woods, have no relation

to each other ! An animal is required to abstain from eating flesh. It is of no consequence whether it had previously the inclination of a lion or of a lamb ! Another animal is commanded to live in the water. It is of no consequence whether it had previously the inclination of a bird, or of a fish !

“But the previous natural character is the chief element of which the subsequent moral character is composed. What else can make natural depravity, but the previous existence of a strong, constant and exclusive inclination, in direct opposition to a subsequent law ? What could make the natural depravity of man, but an exclusive inclination to malice, cruelty, falsehood, and fraud, before the indulgence of such propensities was checked or forbidden by God ?”

We have extended this article beyond its originally designed limits, but hope that it has not outlasted the patience of our readers. We have not even touched on several points, connected with this subject, and involved in the late controversy. Our remarks, have been confined to the statement of a few principles and considerations, which we should have supposed were universally admitted, if we had not known that the doctrines of Calvinism expressly contradicted them. The time has not yet come when men shall think it no recommendation of religion, that it is abstruse, cloudy, and mystical, and no objection to it, that it coincides with the lessons of experience, and the dictates of common sense.

THE DISCONTENTED PENDULUM.

From the Youth's Magazine, an English publication.

An old clock that had stood for fifty years in a farmer's kitchen, without giving its owner any cause of complaint, early one summer's morning, before the family was stirring, suddenly stopped.

Upon this, the dial-plate (if we may credit the fable) changed countenance with alarm ; the hands made a vain effort to continue their course ; the wheels remained motionless with surprise ; the weights hung speechless ; each member felt disposed to lay the blame on the others. At length the dial instituted a

formal inquiry as to the cause of the stagnation, when hands, wheels, weights, with one voice, protested their innocence. But now a faint tick was heard below from the pendulum, who thus spoke;

"I confess myself to be the sole cause of the present stoppage; and I am willing, for the general satisfaction, to assign my reasons. The truth is, that I am tired of ticking." Upon hearing this, the old clock became so enraged that it was on the very point of striking.

"Lazy wire!" exclaimed the dial-plate, holding up its hands. "Very good!" replied the pendulum, "it is vastly easy for you, Mistress Dial, who have always, as every body knows, set yourself up above me,—it is vastly easy for you, I say, to accuse other people of laziness! You, who have had nothing to do all the days of your life but to stare people in the face, and to amuse yourself with watching all that goes on in the kitchen! Think, I beseech you, how you would like to be shut up for life in this dark closet, and to wag backwards and forwards year after year, as I do." "As to that," said the dial, "is there not a window in your house, on purpose for you to look through?"

"For all that," resumed the pendulum, "it is very dark here; and, altho there is a window, I dare not stop, even for an instant, to look out at it. Besides, I am really tired of my way of life; and, if you wish, I'll tell you how I took this disgust at my employment. I happened this morning to be calculating how many times I should have to tick in the course of only the next twenty-four hours; perhaps some of you above there can give me the exact sum."

The minute-hand, being quick at figures, presently replied, "Eighty-six thousand four hundred times."

"Exactly so," replied the pendulum; "well, I appeal to you all, if the very thought of this was not enough to fatigue one; and when I began to multiply the strokes of one day by those of months and years, really it is no wonder if I felt discouraged at the

prospect; so, after a great deal of reasoning and hesitation, thinks I to myself, 'I'll stop.'

The dial could scarcely keep its countenance during this harangue; but resuming its gravity, thus replied;

"Dear Mr. Pendulum, I am really astonished that such a useful, industrious person as yourself, should have been overcome by this sudden action. It is true you have done a great deal of work in your time; so have we all, and are likely to do; which, altho it may fatigue us to *think* of, the question is, whether it will fatigue us to *do*. Would you now do me the favor to give about a half a dozen strokes, to illustrate my argument?"

The pendulum complied, and ticked six times at its usual pace. "Now," resumed the dial, "may I be allowed to inquire, if that exertion was at all fatiguing or disagreeable to you?"

"Not in the least," replies the pendulum, "it is not of six strokes that I complain, nor of sixty, but of millions?"

"Very good," replied the dial; "but recollect that tho you may *think* of a million strokes in an instant, you are required to *execute* but one; and that, however often you may hereafter have to swing, a moment will always be given you to swing in."

"That consideration staggers me, I confess," said the pendulum. "Then, I hope," resumed the dial-plate, "we shall all immediately return to our duty; for the maids will lie in bed till noon, if we stand idling thus."

Upon this, the weights, who had never been accused of *light* conduct, used all their influence in urging him to proceed; when, as with one consent, the wheels began to turn, the hands began to move, the pendulum began to swing, and, to its credit, ticked as loud as ever; while a red beam of the rising sun that streamed through a hole in the kitchen, shining full upon the dial-plate, it brightened up as if nothing had been the matter.

When the farmer came down to breakfast that morning, upon looking at the clock, he declared that his watch had gained half an hour in the night.

MORAL.

A celebrated modern writer says, "Take care of the *minutes*, and the *hours* will take care of themselves." This is an admirable remark, and might be very seasonably recollected when we begin to be "weary in well doing," from the thought of having much to do. The present moment is all we have to do with, in any sense; the past is irrecoverable; the future is uncertain; nor is it fair to burden one moment with the weight of the next. Sufficient unto the moment is the trouble thereof. If we had to walk a hundred miles, we should still have to set but one step at a time, and this process continued would infallibly bring us to our journey's end. Fatigue generally begins, and is always increased, by calculating in a minute the exertion of hours.

Thus, in looking forward to future life, let us recollect that we have not to sustain all its toil, to endure all its sufferings, or encounter all its crosses, at once. One moment comes laden with its own little burdens, then flies, and is succeeded by another no heavier than the last; if one could be borne, so can another and another.

Even looking forward to a single day, the spirit may sometimes faint from an anticipation of the duties, the labors, the trials to temper and patience, that may be expected. Now this is unjustly laying the burden of many thousand moments upon one. Let any one resolve always to do *right now*, leaving *then* to do as it can; and if he were to live to the age of Methuselah, he would never do wrong. But the common error is to resolve to act right after breakfast, or after dinner, or to-morrow morning, or next time; but *now, just now, this once*, we must go on the same as ever. It is easy, for instance, for the most ill-tempered person to resolve that the next time he is provoked, he

will not let his temper overcome him; but the victory would be to subdue temper on the *present* provocation. If, without taking up the burden of the future, we would always make the *single* effort at the *present* moment, while there would, at any one time, be very little to do, yet, by this simple process continued, every thing would at last be done.

It seems easier to do right to-morrow than to-day, merely because we forget that when to-morrow comes, *then* will be *now*. Thus life passes with many, in resolutions for the future, which the present never fulfils.

It is not thus with those, who, "by *patient continuance in well-doing*, seek for glory, honor, and immortality." Day by day, minute by minute, they execute the appointed task, to which the requisite measure of time and strength is proportioned; and thus, having worked while it was called day, they at length rest from their labors, and their "works follow them."

Let us then, "whatever our hands find to do, do it with all our might, recollecting that *'now is the proper and accepted time.'*"

From the Unitarian Miscellany.

ATHANASIAN CREED.

A CORRESPONDENT has intimated to us, that some account of the Athanasian Creed would be acceptable to many of our readers. He says, that tho it is often referred to in our work, there are numbers who have never seen such a creed, and who know nothing of its contents. We thank him for his suggestion, and will readily give the information desired. We have been so long familiar with this extraordinary production ourselves, that we had not adverted to the circumstance of its rejection from the prayer-book of the American Episcopal Church, and of its being consequently almost unknown in our country, excepting to professed students. There is not per-

haps a single protestant place of worship in the United States, in which the Athanasian Creed is read or received. And for this we have reason to be thankful.

We will commence our account of this confession of faith, with a few notices of its history. In the first place, it is pretty evident that it was not composed by the bishop, whose name it bears. The principal reasons on which the learned found this conclusion are these. It is not contained, nor even alluded to, in any of the genuine works of Athanasius. It is not mentioned by any of the writers who immediately succeeded him. It was not appealed to in the controversies between the Eastern and Western Churches, in the seventh and ninth centuries. It was not cited till about the year 800, nor received into the church till about the year 1000, altho Athanasius died as early as the year 378. The learned Fabricius is of opinion that it was composed in Latin, long after the fifth century, and subsequently translated into Greek. It is probable therefore, that it was not in existence till some centuries after the death of Athanasius; and that it received his name, on account of his having been, throughout his life, the staunch champion of the doctrine of the trinity.

The Athanasian Creed is either authorized or allowed by the Greek Church, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Established Church of England; that is, by a great majority of the Christian world. It is appointed to be sung or said, in the English Church, thirteen times a year, at morning prayer, instead of the Apostles' Creed. The Episcopal Church of America, at a Convention of seven of the States, held in Philadelphia, in the year 1785, had the wisdom to exclude this confession from their prayer book; and notwithstanding the exhortations of the archbishops of Canterbury and York, to receive it again into the service, they persisted in its exclusion. We will now copy, shine, this celebrated creed

from the English Book of Common Prayer; without entertaining the least fear that any of our readers will be converted by it.

THE CREED OF ST. ATHANASIUS.

Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith. Which Faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

And the Catholic Faith is this; that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity; neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the substance. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost.

But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one; the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost. The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate, and the Holy Ghost uncreate. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible. The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghost eternal; and yet there are not three eternals, but one eternal. As also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated; but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty; and yet there are not three Almighties, but one Almighty.

So the Father is God, the Son is God and the Holy Ghost is God, and yet there are not three Gods, but one God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord; and yet not three Lords, but one Lord.

For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge every person by himself to be God and Lord; so are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion to say, There be three Gods or three Lords.

The Father is made of none; neither created nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone; not made nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father, and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding. So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.

And in this Trinity none is afore, or after other; none is greater or less than another; but the whole three Persons are co-eternal together, and co-equal. So that in all things, as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worshipped.

He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity.

Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation, that we also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man, God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and man of the substance of his mother, born in the world. Perfect God and perfect man; of a reasonable soul, and human flesh subsisting. Equal to the Father as touching his Godhead; and inferior to the Father, as touching his manhood. Who altho he be God, and man, yet he is not two, but one Christ; one, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God; one altogether; not by confusion of substance, but by unity of Person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.

Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty; from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies; and shall give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting; and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.

This is the Catholic Faith; which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.

There! that is the Athanasian Creed;—a long, antithetical, damnatory chapter of contradictions and absurdities, laid down as an infallible "exposition of the Gospel of peace, pardon, and love.

It has been remarked of it, that, in its primary principles, it consisted of two parts, of doctrines, and of curses; the former of which are not intelligible, and the latter were. "If it were the reverse," says Dr. Jortin, "it would have been more for the credit of the writer." For our own parts, we read these same curses with the excited, and not unpleasant emotions, with which we should read a high flight of imaginative poetry. Not that we invariably peruse them with this feeling; for we are filled with sorrow and indignation, when we revert to those dark times, in which an ecclesiastical curse was no matter of poetry, but a very serious thing; and we thank God, that altho we are not even now in the full light, yet the palpable darkness of those ages has past away. When occupied by such reflections, however, we cannot help being amused with the high-handed and daring confi-

dence of what are called the "damnatory clauses" of this composition. Let us just look back to the second clause. "*Which Faith,*" that is, the string of mysticisms which follows, "*except every one do keep whole, and undefiled,*"—what will be the consequence? Why, "*WITHOUT DOUBT he shall perish everlastingly.*" We call that, the sublime of theological impudence.

"If it were considered concerning Athanasius' creed," says Jeremy Taylor, in his 'Liberty of Prophecy,' "how many people understand it not, how contrary to natural reason it seems, how little the Scripture says of those curiosities of explication, and how tradition was not clear for the article itself, much less for those forms and minutes, it had not been amiss if the final judgement had been left to Jesus Christ; and indeed to me it seems very hard to put *uncharitableness* into the creed, and so to make it become as *an article of faith.*"

ATTEMPT AT CONVERSION.

While Mr. Murray was a member of Mr. Whitefield's church, a young lady was, as he supposed, *deluded* by the Universalists, to join their standard; and Mr. M. made one of a committee to visit and reclaim her. The following is his own account of the matter.

"The young lady received us with much kindness and condescension; while, as I glanced my eye upon her fine countenance; beaming with intelligence, mingled pity and contempt grew in my bosom. After the first ceremonies; we sat for some time silent; at length I drew up a heavy sigh, and uttered a pathetic sentiment, relative to the deplorable condition of those, who live, and die in unbelief; and I concluded a violent declamation, by pronouncing, *with great earnestness, He that believeth not, shall be damned.*

"And pray, Sir," said the young lady, with great sweetness, "Pray, Sir, what is the unbeliever damned for not believing?"

What is he damned for not believing? *Why, he is damned for not believing.*

"But, my dear Sir, I asked what was that which he did not believe, for which he was damned?"

Why, for not believing in Jesus Christ, to be sure.

"Do you mean to say, that unbelievers are damned for not believing there was such a person as Jesus Christ?"

No, I do not; a man may believe there was such a person, and yet be damned.

"What then, Sir, must he believe, in order to avoid damnation?"

Why he must believe that Jesus Christ is a complete Savior.

"Well, suppose he were to believe that Jesus Christ was the complete Savior of others, would this belief save him?"

No, he must believe that Christ is his complete Savior; every individual must believe for *himself*, that Jesus Christ is his complete Savior.

"Why, Sir, is Jesus Christ the Savior of any *unbelievers*?"

No, madam.

"Why, then, should any *unbeliever* believe that Jesus Christ is his Savior, if he be not his Savior?"

I say, he is not the Savior of any one, until he believes.

"Then, if Jesus be not the Savior of the *unbeliever* until he *believes*, the *unbeliever* is called upon to believe a lie. It appears to me, Sir, that Jesus is the complete Savior of *unbelievers*; and that unbelievers are called upon to believe the truth; and that, by *believing*, they are saved, in their own apprehension, from all those dreadful fears, which are consequent upon a state of conscious condemnation."

No, madam; you are dreadfully, I trust not fatally misled. Jesus never was, nor never will be, the Savior of any unbeliever.

"Do you think Jesus is your Savior, Sir?"

I hope he is.

"Were you *always* a believer, Sir?"

No, madam.

"Then you were once an unbeliever; that is, you once believed that Jesus Christ was not your Savior. Now, as you say, he never *was*, nor ever *will be*, the Saviour of any *unbeliever*; as you were once an *unbeliever*, he never can be your Savior."

He never was my Savior till I believed.

"Did he never die for you till you believed, Sir?"

Here I was extremely embarrassed, and most devoutly wished myself out of her habitation; I sighed bitterly, expressed deep commiseration for those deluded souls, who had nothing but head-knowledge; drew out my watch, *discovered it was late*; and, recollecting an engagement, observed it was time to take leave.

I was extremely mortified; the young lady observed my confusion, but was too generous to pursue her triumph. I arose to depart; the company arose; she urged us to tarry; addressed each of us in the language of kindness. Her countenance seemed to wear a resemblance of the Heaven which she contemplated; it was stamped by benignity; and when we bade her adieu, she enriched us by her good wishes.

CALVIN'S FIVE POINTS.

We give the following extract from Buck's Theological Dictionary, that our readers may possess a document that will afford in few words the essence of Calvinism. We need inform but very few of them that *the five points* do not embrace our sentiments; nor do we apprehend that we hazard much, in offering them without comment.

"The following statement is taken principally from the writings of Calvin, and the decisions at Dort, compressed in as few words as possible.

"1. They maintain that God hath chosen a certain number of the fallen race of Adam in Christ, before the foundation of the world, unto eternal glory, according to his immutable purpose, and of his free grace and love, without the least foresight of faith, good

works, or any conditions performed by the creature; and that the rest of mankind he was pleased to pass by, and ordain to dishonor and wrath, for their sins, to the praise of his vindictive justice.

"2. They maintain that tho the death of Christ be a most perfect sacrifice, and satisfaction for sins, of infinite value, abundantly sufficiently to expiate the sins of the whole world; and tho on this ground the Gospel is to be preached to all mankind indiscriminately; yet it was the will of God that Christ, by the blood of the cross, should efficaciously redeem all those, and those only, who were from eternity elected to salvation, and given to him by the Father.

"3. They maintain that mankind are totally depraved, in consequence of the fall of the first man, who, being their public head, his sin involved the corruption of all his posterity; and which corruption extends over the whole soul, and renders it unable to turn to God, or to do any thing truly good, and exposes it to his righteous displeasure, both in this world and that which is to come.

"4. They maintain that all whom God hath predestinated unto life, he is pleased, in his appointed time, effectually to call by his word and spirit out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ.

"5. Lastly: They maintain that those whom God has effectually called and sanctified by his spirit, shall never finally fall from a state of grace. They admit that true believers may fall partially, and would fall totally and finally but for the mercy and faithfulness of God, who keepeth the feet of his saints; also, that he who bestoweth the grace of perseverance, bestoweth it by means of reading and hearing the word, meditation, exhortations, threatening, and promises, but that none of these things imply the possibility of a believer's falling from a state of justification.

For the Christian Repository.

AUTHORS OF THE APPEAL.

MR. EDITOR,—It has doubtless been anticipated that the Authors of the Appeal would make a public defence against the attack made on their characters by the Editors of the "*Universalist Magazine*,"* and, indeed, such a defence has actually been prepared for the press; but, by the earnest and sober advice of our friends, we have thought it best to suspend it. We have been informed that, as far as the general sentiment of the public can be ascertained, the serious and reflecting consider the attack as the effusion of a party spirit, and in character far below the dignity of christian ministers.

The controversy has assumed a character wholly personal, and our antagonists have descended to the lowest grade of personalities—raking up insulated, inadvertent, and indigested expressions, used in private conversation, and publishing them to the world! What person of sense will not pity the cause which requires such means to support it? or what cultivated mind would not be disgusted, on seeing a controversy of this kind protracted? Feeling a strong reluctance to following the course which they have marked out, in filling the public prints with crimination and recrimination of a personal nature, and being persuaded that the public in general, (all but those whose partial attachments place them beyond the power of conviction) will do us and themselves the justice to think of us according to what they have seen, and shall know of us in future, we are willing to risk the decision in their hands.

As it respects the final issue of this unhappy contest, I am unable to make any probable conjecture. We have once made an amicable settlement with *two* of the Editors; but, to our great astonishment they have assumed the right to violate it! Since this, we have offered them terms for a settlement which, I am

* See *Christian Repository*, Vol. III.

confident, would be esteemed fair and honorable by all disinterested persons; but they have all been rejected! We must now leave the event to Him who rules all things in wisdom and goodness.

I remain your sincere friend and
brother in the gospel,

JACOB WOOD.

P. S. All Editors of papers and periodical works who will have the goodness to insert the above, shall receive the sincere thanks of J. W.

FROM WILLIAM WORRALL, PASTOR OF THE UNIVERSALIST CHURCH, JOHN-STREET, GLASGOW, TO MR. HENRY FITZ, EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NEW-YORK.

Dear Brother in the Lord,

Being now, through the kindness of a friend, in possession of the first and second volumes of the Gospel Herald, I am authorized by the churches in our connexion to express the high opinion they entertain, * * * * *

Mr. Van Velsan's challenge, subsequent shuffling, and final disgrace, must have had great influence upon the minds of the reflecting part of community. Never before was Calvinism so exposed and put to shame. Proceed, Sir, as a true and faithful soldier, in the van of the armies under the direction of the "Captain of Salvation." Be instant in season and out of season, in making inroads upon the ramifications of the kingdom of darkness in the dreary dominions of sin and death; and let the sound of your triumphs, from time to time, cheer and animate the lovers of truth on this side the Atlantic. We had no idea, until the reception by us of the Gospel Herald, and a benevolent epistle from Mr. Stephen R. Smith, New-Hartford, that we had such a host of friends in the United States; and consequently, the satisfaction communicated by the information is inexpressible. We lost by reason of death our late

pastor, Mr. N. Douglas, truly a loss to us, but great gain to him; he has exchanged earthly suffering for heavenly felicity. Particulars concerning this interesting event, you will find in the funeral discourse, published on the occasion, a copy of which you are requested to accept.

Theological truth is extending its influence amongst us, in this corner of the vineyard; we only seem to want a few zealous laborers, men of integrity and talent, and great good might be effected. We already hope, that the present intercourse now commencing with our American brethren, will be made instrumental under the great Head of the church for the attainment of an object so desirable. Along with this, I have written also to Mr. E. Mitchell, Pastor, New-York, in which I have entered into some particulars which nearly concern us. I have requested the third volume of the Gospel Herald, when complete, the whole of the other seven Universalist periodical publications, from the commencement of each, if possible; the life of Mr. J. Murray, and Kelly's Union. Should this be found too troublesome to Mr. Mitchell, would you have the goodness to assist? The brethren here are upon the very tip-toe of expectation. The money will be remitted, or paid here according to order.

Hoping that you may perceive the house of Saul, which is death, tending to decay, and the house of David which is love, progressively acquiring strength, I remain, dear brother, tho at a great local distance, your coadjutor in proclaiming glory to God in the highest, on earth peace and good will to men.

WILLIAM WORRALL,

No. 102 Argyle-street, Glasgow.

Feb. 26, 1823.

CHARACTER OF MR. ELHANAN WINCHESTER.

I shall be pardoned the attempt of a very feeble delineation of the character which I have always ad-

mired, loved, and venerated. Feeble indeed it must be, as the original was such as not often arrests the attention of mankind yet I shall be satisfied, if able to sketch an outline strictly comporting with truth, and descriptive of only the most predominant features of him "whose praise was in all our churches."

Mr. Winchester was born at Brookline, Mass. in the year 1750. It has been asserted that no peculiar traits of genius marked the first years of juvenile life. But as he approached manhood, when the mental powers began to expand, the native talents of a mind which was afterwards to astonish mankind, began to exhibit themselves. His powers of memory were soon observable. His natural seriousness and predisposition to the concerns of religion were perceived, and at a very early age, say about 19, he commenced preaching as an itinerant Baptist. His cotemporaries and associates regarded him as a young man of great promise, who would shortly become a "burning and shining light," in which they and their fellow christians should greatly "rejoice." Already he preached with a zeal, a pathos and animation rarely seen in others. His travels and labors soon extended from Vermont to South Carolina. In this enlarged space of country, hundreds, perhaps thousands were awakened to a serious view of the importance of religion, and to this day, many, who did not keep pace with him in his mental travel, nor partake of the enlargement of his views of "the great salvation," still acknowledge Mr. W. as the instrument of their "turning from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God."

While at the Southward, he received the first impression favorable to Universal Grace. Shortly, he sailed for England, where he tarried about 9 years, preaching and writing much. In London, he was well received—and in that city he delivered and published his lectures on the prophecies, with many other subordinate works, in illustration and support of the doctrine of the Restoration. On his return to America,

which was about the year 1793, he was received with a high degree of satisfaction by such as had imbibed his sentiments, and even by many who did not subscribe to them. He was heard with attention by most classes of Christians, and it was very rare that the meeting-houses of the several denominations were not opened to him, and crowded with attentive and admiring auditors.

The various orders of clergy in the United States associated with him, as with a man from whom they must have derived pleasure and profit. His extensive reading, his enlarged acquaintance with mankind, the fund of knowledge, stored in a memory bordering upon intuition, rendered his society interesting and instructive to all descriptions of men. But his urbanity, and the benevolence which glowed in his bosom, his simple unaffected manners rendered his conversation doubly interesting. Mr. W. had none of that imposing haughtiness, which lays humble inquiry under a painful restraint, nothing of that asperity of mind which often wounds the feelings of an opponent, and silences without convincing him. He respected the tender feelings of all christians, was charitable to their ignorance and absurdity, and treated with "meekness those who opposed themselves" to what he considered the truth of the gospel. His literary acquirements were by no means of a limited or superficial nature. With Latin, Greek and Hebrew he had an acquaintance, in which he was excelled by few; and he was able to preach intelligibly in the French language. The warmth of feeling with which he contemplated religion, the deep and solemn interest which he took in all its concerns, and his habit of piety, "which had "grown with his growth and strengthened with his strength," gave a pathos to his public discourses, which awakened and sustained the attention of the crowd who waited on his ministry; and tho some might think him an enthusiast, yet his was not the enthusiasm that distracts the mind, confounds the ideas, or disgusts the taste.

Under his impressive preaching, ridicule felt disarmed of half her weapons, and wit, which sometimes sports with sacred things, in his presence, tacitly confessed the object above her reach. E. T.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM BR. M. NEEDHAM.

‘DEAR BROTHER,—I send you a short extract from the Corresponding Letter of the Warren Association of Baptists, for 1821, which, if agreeable, you may insert in the Repository. After stating the encouragement of sending the gospel to the heathen, they say; “Brethren, the word has gone forth—the world will submit to Christ. It is his by creation—his by the purchase of his blood—and it must be his by spiritual and holy subjugation. There is encouragement to action and to prayer.—

“Come then, and added to thy many crowns,
Receive yet one, the crown of all the earth,
Thou who alone art worthy.”’

Remark. These Baptists, in word, seem not far from the kingdom of heaven. May they one day be able to realize the fulness of their enlarged views.

EDITOR.

HEATHEN MYTHOLOGY! PURGATORY!

In consequence of the different sentiments of Universalists, and the existing difficulties between our brethren in the vicinity of Boston, with which our readers are already much to their grief, acquainted, Br. Turner published a discourse, expressing his general views of those religious tenets that relate to the subject. This discourse has called forth in the Magazine of Boston two opponents, one, signed T. W. and the other *Apollos*. With the merits of the controversy, if such controversy exists, (for it does not yet appear that Br. Turner has taken any notice of his opponents,) we have nothing to do. We consider this as a matter which belongs to them, and not to us. But the *heathen Mythology* and *Purgatory*, which *Apollos* has introduced, we have concluded to lay before our readers. “The author states,” says *Apollos*, speaking of Br. Turner, “that the doctrine,” meaning future punishment, “has been held by a large majority of those who believed in the final salvation of

all men, since the days of the Apostles.—This we acknowledge, and the same was held by the heathen *priests* and *philosophers*, long before the birth of Christ, which proves that it belongs to the *heathen mythology*, a doctrine which these men with the Roman Catholics embrace, calling it *Purgatory*."

We recollect reading of an old friend Quaker, who would neither shed the blood of man or beast. Being one day offended with his dog, he sent him forth into the street, saying, *I will not hurt thee, but I will give thee a bad name*. And so saying he cried out, *mad dog!* The consequence, as might easily be conjectured, was, the poor dog soon found too many enemies, to breathe. The reader can apply the moral. The opposers of universal salvation, have long thought the old Quaker policy a good one, and therefore thought they would give us a *bad name*. So they cried, *the devil was a universal preacher*; and no doubt they have kept ten souls in fear of us, by this *bad name*, where the subtle metaphysics of an Edwards has one. Now the doctrine of future punishment is to be put down, what is to be done? Give it a *bad name*. Cry *heathen mythology* and *purgatory*. Verily, Apollos, we do believe thee a bold fellow [*"we BOLDLY contradict," he says in the course of his piece*] to give "a large majority of those who believed in the final salvation of all men since the days of the apostles,"—a large majority of the brethren of thy faith, a *bad name*. We hope thou wilt read, and think, and be ashamed; for tho the Quaker's poor dog fell a victim, because he had a *bad name*; yet the race of dogs is not extinct. They always might, and forever may, eat of the crumbs that fall from their master's table.

ANECDOTE.

Charles II. hearing of a high character of a preacher in the country, attended one of his sermons. Expressing his dissatisfaction, one of his courtiers replied, that the preacher was applauded to the skies by his congregation. "Aye," observed the king, "I suppose his nonsense suits *their* nonsense.—*Westpolana*."

MISCELLANEOUS.

Excommunications.—Mrs. Maria Townsend has lately been excommunicated in the city of New-York, for a disbelief of the endless misery of a portion of mankind.

Br. Hubbard H. Winchester, now a preacher of our connection, has lately been excommunicated from the Congregational Church in Marlborough, Vermont, for disbelieving endless punishment, and preaching universal salvation.

The celebrated Hindoo philosopher and theologian, *Rammohun Roy*, who recently became converted to Christianity, contemplates a visit to the United States. In a letter to a gentleman in Baltimore, dated Calcutta, Oct. 9, 1822, he states, that he shall probably be in this country in the course of the next year. *Rammohun Roy* is a native of Bengal, and by his writings in the English, and several of the Eastern languages, has proved himself to be one of the most learned and remarkable men of the present age.

Baltimore Patriot.

Swearing.—St. Chrysostom proposes a singular method to facilitate the leaving off of this practice of customary swearing. "Wouldst thou know," says the father, "by what means thou mayest get rid of this wicked custom of swearing, I'll tell thee a way, which, if thou wilt take, will certainly prove successful. Every time whenever thou shalt find thyself to have let slip an oath, punish thyself for it by missing the next meal. Such a course as this, tho troublesome to the flesh, will be profitable to the spirit; and cause a quick amendment; for the tongue will need no other monitor to make it take heed of swearing another time if it hath been thus punished with hunger and thirst for its former transgression, and knows it shall be so punished again if ever it commits the like crime hereafter."—*Register.*

Proposals have been issued at Little Falls, N. Y. for publishing a paper, entitled "THE GOSPEL INQUIRER," devoted to the dissemination of the doctrine of Universal Salvation. To be published semi-monthly at one dollar per annum.—*Gos. Adv.*

Br. Edward Turner of Charlestown, Mass. has issued proposals for publishing a small periodical work, at 75 cents per annum. Further particulars concerning this contemplated work we are not able to give, by reason of the subscription paper received, being mislaid.

DEDICATION AND INSTALLATION. X

The new and elegantly finished Meeting-House, erected for the Central Society of Universalists at the corner of Bulfinch-Street and Bulfinch-Place, was on Wednesday last dedicated to the service of the Most High. Service as follows: viz. Lessons from the Scriptures; Introductory Prayer by Rev. Mr. Streeter of Portsmouth; Dedictory Prayer by Rev. Mr. Mitchell of New-York; Dedictory Address by Rev. Mr. Dean; Concluding Prayer by Rev. Mr. Winchester of Vermont; Benediction by Rev. Mr. Dean.

In the afternoon, the Rev. Paul Dean was installed Pastor over the Society hereafter to worship in this house, incorporated as the Central Society of Universalists in Boston. Exercises as follows: viz. Lessons from the Scriptures; Introductory Prayer, by Rev. Mr. Streeter of Salem; Installation Sermon by Rev. Mr. Mitchell of New-York; Installation Prayer by Rev. Mr. Streeter of Portsmouth; Delivery of the Scriptures and Address to the Society, by Rev. Mr. Turner of Charlestown; Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Streeter of Portsmouth; Concluding Prayer by the same; and Benediction by Rev. Mr. Dean.

The exercises throughout the day were appropriate, and marked with religious solemnity. The installation sermon by Rev. Mr. Mitchell, was an able and argumentative discourse, and delivered in that style of energetic eloquence for which the speaker is particularly distinguished. Several select pieces of music were performed by the choir between the various exercises, in a masterly style.—*Boston paper.*

OBITUARY.

Died in Barre, May 14, Col. BENJAMIN WALKER, aged 72, a veteran of the Revolution, distinguished for his services in public life, and endeared to his friends by his virtues in the domestic circle.

In Bridgewater, May 11, Capt. BENONI SHAW, Jr. aged 28 years. Mr. Shaw was much respected, beloved as a friend, and as a christian he was an animated example of piety and devotion.

ON THE DEATH OF MR. U. S.

Relentless death, whose appetite doth rage,
And, for his victim, marks both youth and age,
Upon an only son has laid his hand ;—
No skill nor physic could his claim withstand,
But from the dear companion of his bed,
Has snatch'd a husband, yea her help and head.
No soothing care, nor medicine could save
Her helpmate from the coffin and the grave.
Almost without a warning was the blow,
With scarce a struggle, did he seem to go.
Scarce was disease upon his body laid,
When from this life his exit he had made ;
His helpless offspring have a father lost ;
He's left this world for Canaan's blessed coast.
And tho his wife in tears her eyes may steep ;
Tho friends may mourn and sonless parents weep ;
Yet we may hope in heaven he finds his rest
Among the spirits of the truly blest.
Tho here on earth they mourning may sojourn,
And bathe with tears their son and husband's urn,
The time shall come when they once more shall meet.
And death no more their union separate.
When every creature of the human race,
Shall join in one to sing redeeming grace,
This family shall with the concert join,
And sing the universal song divine.
When death shall cease to hold despotic sway,
And life eternal brings in endless day ;—
When sin and misery wholly disappear,
And every one in righteousness shall share,
From every eye the tear shall cease to flow,
And every heart the love of God shall know.

J. J.

CHRISTIAN REPOSITORY.

No. 2.

AUGUST, 1823.

Vol. IV.

SERMON, NO. XI.

1 Cor. ix. 26.—*I therefore so run, not as uncertainly ; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air,*

It is one of the excellencies of the Christian revelation, that its most sublime truths are capable of being reduced to a level with every man's understanding. This we might expect in a system in whose truths all are interested, and which is designed to promote the welfare of the rich and poor, the wise and the ignorant, the learned and unlearned, in a word, of all mankind. To attain this end, figures of speech are employed, to illustrate important truths ; and allusions to ancient practices and customs are frequently made by the inspired writers, to enforce their doctrines and impress a sense of the duties arising from a belief of them, upon the hearts of their readers. Of this method of instruction, the text is an example.

In those ages in which ancient Greece was in her highest glory, she instituted the Olympic games, which were celebrated every fourth year, with great parade and splendor. Those who were admitted as candidates for the honors bestowed upon the worthy, prepared themselves for their exercises by rules, and modes of living that were supposed to be useful in promoting strength and vigor of body ; and when they had undergone the necessary preparation, and had divested themselves of every incumbrance to their persons, and laid aside "every weight" that could impede their progress, or diminish the force and action of any physical power, they fought, wrestled, and ran ; and he that was victorious, when the exercise had ended, and was declared by the judges to have conformed to the laws and rules of the games, was crowned, and received the plaudits of the whole assembly. This is a brief history of those transactions, a knowledge of which is necessary to an understand-

ing of much of the epistolary part of the New-Testament, in which there are frequent allusions to these combats. Thus in the text, and the associated passages, Paul alludes to these things, in his description of the Christian life. "Know ye not, that they who run in a race, run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain. And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown, but we an incorruptible. I therefore so run, not as uncertainly, so fight I, not as one that beateth the air."

First, The life which the Christian is required to live is represented in the Scriptures by various similitudes; it is called a race, a battle, and sometimes a wrestling; but in every instance it supposes a prize to be obtained by him who is victorious; and this prize is to be received when the race is ended, or the battle fought. I consider this subject of sufficient importance, to justify the utmost plainness of speech; that if I am correct in my views, my observations may have the deeper impression, and if incorrect, I may lay myself open to more just and consistent views. We are inclined to believe that we have a present reward in the virtuous deeds which we perform here, and that this reward is amply sufficient to cover all the sacrifices that are necessarily made in pursuing a virtuous course. To prove this, we adduce the testimony of scripture, "in keeping the commandments is great reward." It will be found difficult to prove that this is not, at least, partially true; nor have we any desire to prove to the contrary. But does it necessarily follow, that because we have a present reward in acts of virtue and religion, that there is nothing in reversion, which the virtuous and faithful servant of Christ will receive when his race is completed, and which even now, he holds in prospect, and with reference to which he acts, and which has great influence in stimulating him to activity, faithfulness, and perseverance in his course? Does it necessarily follow, that because I receive a present

felicity in whatever good I do, that, therefore I have no greater good to expect hereafter, which when received shall take the character of a reward, a crown, or prize? May not the idea of a present and a future reward be so associated, that the former shall be necessary to the latter? These questions ought to be discussed with patience and candor. When you undertake any enterprize, you feel a conscious joy at every step you take in your progress, and why do you so? Because every step brings you nearer the end which you have in view, the prize for which you undertook the arduous race. The husbandman is cheered each day of his labors, with the consciousness of duty faithfully performed, but this is because he has the rich harvest in prospect; the prize is before him; he keeps in constant view the goal at the end of his race, and this stimulates his exertions and sustains his endeavors. But if the harvest should fail, he would say, "how have I labored in vain and spent my strength for naught." You would not hear him assert, that the immediate pleasure resulting from his exertions, was itself a full reward. These observations exhibit a point in which the two ideas unite. We find a present reward, because the effort to obtain it leads to a future and greater recompense. The last idea is necessary to the first. We shall now see how far these views are justified by the voice of the scriptures.

That the apostles and primitive believers did not act from the supposition that they had no reward to expect for their faithful adherence to their Master's cause, except what they received in the present time, is evident from the declaration, that "if in this life only they had hope, they were of all men the most miserable." Now if the theory which asserts, that the present reward of virtue is sufficient, be perfectly correct, the above declaration must be very incorrect and even false. For according to that theory, the there were no future life, or no reward beyond the grave, yet the course of virtue which these persons pursued, would render them even here, of all men,

the most happy. We shall be assisted in arriving at a correct view of this point, by attending to this simple fact, that whatever we look for in future, as a reward, a crown, or prize, to recompense present efforts, must necessarily be accounted a reward, a crown, or a prize, when we receive it. If we say otherwise, we must admit that the apostles acted under the influence of a deception; which I believe very few will be prepared to assert. It may be said, that the primitive Christians acted under the influence of the hope of a happy immortality. Be it so. We have no objection. But yet, this happy immortality was the prize, the crown for which they ran; the hope of it sustained them in adversity, stimulated their efforts, made them faithful and persevering, and when they received it, must have been considered as forming an immense balance in their favor, for all personal sufferings, "a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

Here I anticipate a supposed difficulty; there may be an objection to these statements, arising from the alleged difference between a reward and a gift. "The satisfaction, derived from a faithful observance of the commands of Christ, is a reward; eternal life is a free gift." This is the form of the objection, and we shall proceed to give it an answer. I admit, that a man may receive as a gift, that which cannot in strictness of speech be called his reward or wages; but still the gift may have as great and even greater influence to stimulate him to duty, than the wages stipulated by his employer. The gift is so denominated, because it is something additional to the wages, and not embraced in that article, but with the person who receives it, it is truly a reward, because he has reference to it in his labors. You tell a man whom you employ in your service, that he shall receive as a compensation a certain sum for every day's labor, which sum shall not be detained in your hands until the sun has set, according to a well known provision of the Jewish law. Now, in this case, your servant

receives a present recompence, which as it is stipulated in the contract, is not called a gratuity or gift. But in addition to his wages, you have a right to promise him a sum, at the close of the year, by way of gratuity or gift. Suppose you do this, then, tho' relatively and verbally there is a distinction between the two payments, yet virtually there is none in reference to the receiver. The gift will have as powerful an effect upon the person employed to secure his attachment to your service and his faithfulness in your business, as his wages. Indeed, in his mind the two will be strongly associated. I believe it will not be contended, that if your servant would be inclined to be faithful for the mere consideration of his wages, that he will be likely to be less so, because the promised gratuity is super-added; and hence I think it will not be suggested, that the doctrine in question has an immoral tendency, or is calculated to produce a relaxation of effort in the cause of virtue. If I do not mistake the sense of scripture, it supports the preceding idea. Our Savior told his disciples, in reply to Peter's observation, that "they had left all and followed him," and his question, "what shall we have therefore?" "Verily I say unto you, there is no man, that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting." "Be faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." This is strictly consonant to the spirit of the text and context, and conforms to the similitude which Paul borrowed from the practice at the Grecian games. The crown was never bestowed till the race was completed or the battle fought.

It is proper to mention in this place, the view that Paul entertained of this subject in its relation to himself. Being near the close of an eventful life, which had been principally employed in the service of his Master, he seems to contemplate a future reward, a glorious prize, with rapturous exultation. "I

am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand; I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course; I have kept the faith; *henceforth*, there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge shall give to me at that day; and not to me only, but to all such as love his appearing." Why does the apostle speak of his crown as "laid up for him?" Why not say that he had always worn it, from the commencement of his Christian race? Why does he speak of its being given in future, if he had at all times possessed it? "The Lord, the righteous Judge shall give it to me at that day."

Secondly. We are to show more particularly, what constitutes the crown or prize for which we are to pursue the Christian course.

The preceding article was devoted to the consideration of the fact itself, that God has placed before us an object, which being seen, will animate the Christian in his exertions, and render him more active, patient and persevering in duty; the present article is to consist in defining this object as clearly as we can, with the aid which the scriptures afford us. The holy writers and our Lord himself treat this subject in a very lucid manner, and their representations place it in a most striking point of view. The reward which is promised to the faithful servants of Jesus Christ may be expressed in few words; it is to receive their Master's plaudit, "well done, good and faithful servants;" it is to share his honor; "to him that overcometh will I give to sit down with me upon my throne, even as I also have overcome, and have sat down with my father on his throne;" it is to partake his joy; "enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." "It is a faithful saying, if we suffer we shall also reign with him." The followers of the Lamb were informed from the beginning of what they might expect in the present world. "Bonds and afflictions would abide them;" they would have to "bear about in their bodies the dying of the Lord Jesus;" they might expect to have to "fill up what was behind of the suf-

“sufferings of Christ in the flesh;” and if they suffered “with him,” that is, in his cause, with his temper, in the exercise of his patience, meekness, and love, they would “be glorified together with their Master; they would receive his approbation, as he also was approved of God.” But to receive so great and glorious a reward, they must “be faithful unto death,” “endure to the end,” and finish their course; “by striving lawfully.” In doing these things, the true disciple imitates his Lord, “who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross and despised the shame.”

It was with reference to this object, that Paul declared, “that forgetting the things that were behind, he reached forward for those which were before, and pressed towards the mark, for the prize of his high calling of God in Christ Jesus.” It was this which chastened his conduct, inducing temperance and sobriety; “I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away.” The declaration of Christ was holden in solemn remembrance; “he that denieth me before men, him will I also deny before my Father and his holy angels.”

The approbation of one’s conscience is desirable; but the approbation of heaven is a superior object. The apostle urged the idea of keeping this object in constant view, in the various duties and labors of the Christian life. “No man that warreth, entangleth himself with the affairs of this life, that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier;” and hence, in his advice to Timothy with respect to his conduct as an Evangelist, he set before him, what he considered the strongest inducement to faithfulness, zeal and activity, when he said, “study to show thyself approved unto God.”

Thirdly. The race which the Christian is to run, or the combat in which he must engage, should be particularly described. “I therefore so run, not as uncertainly, so fight I, not as one that beateth the air.” The course, marked out for the apostle is supposed

to be a course of duty, and a course of duty presupposes and implies a course of opposition, and not unfrequently of suffering. We may safely say, that the life which Christianity prescribes is of necessity a warfare, a conflict between "principalities and powers." He who is engaged in it, does not "beat the air," he has real enemies to encounter; and he needs "the whole armor of God" to render him victorious. Say that we have not the opposition which the primitive Christians were obliged to meet; that the spirit of persecution has subsided, and that we are not liable to be called to "prison and to death;" yet we are exposed to the same internal enemies as others have been before us, and they of all others are the most to be dreaded. The apostle described his and his brethren's condition in these brief sentences; "without were fightings, and within were fears." If we are delivered from the former of these trials, that is from open opposition from external enemies, we need not flatter ourselves we are secure; depend upon it, we are not exempt from the danger of internal assaults; and the latter of the evils which afflicted Paul will be found to exist in every man, who is not lulled into a false security. His passions, his disposition and affections must be watched and guarded with the utmost caution, because from them, the greatest danger is to be apprehended. Had Peter been more guarded, and less confident, he would not have turned recreant to his Master, nor have suffered that period of anguish and bitterness, in comparison with which, the vilest indignity of an opposer, and the severest tortures that an enemy of the cross could inflict, would have been light and trifling.

To run with certainty the race appointed us, we must have a fixed object, and a perfect example. In this case no advice could be superior to that which Paul gave to the Hebrews, "Wherefore seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race

that is set before us ; looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith, who, for the joy that was set before him endured the cross and despised the shame." Divest yourselves of every incumbrance ; lay aside every thing that would check your speed ; pursue your course with patience, for this virtue will diminish the fatigues attendant upon your exertions ; it is the virtue which always looks forward, and acts upon things to come ; "ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise." Look steadfastly to the mark of the prize before you, at the end of your course ; it will give alacrity to your steps ; it will preserve you from deviation ; it will keep you from turning to the right hand or the left. Make the Captain of your salvation your example. Consider what actuated, encouraged and supported him in his conflict with the powers of darkness, what strengthened him to pursue his course. It was the "joy before him." For tho it was his "meat and drink to do his father's will," yet he constantly kept in his view the great blessing in reversion. Go, and do likewise, and his joy shall be yours.

SENTIMENTS OF HOPKINSIANS.

We give the following from Buck's Theological Dictionary, and calculate to offer a few remarks on the same in a future number. We presume it will be new authentic history to many of our readers, while a few may have it already in their possession. It is written testimony of what has passed in the ears of thousands, and for the sake of the many, it is hoped the few will not complain because we have given it a place in our columns.

Hopkinsians, so called from the Rev. Samuel Hopkins, D. D. an American Divine, who in his sermons and tracts has made several additions to the sentiments first advanced by the celebrated Jonathan Edwards, late president of New-Jersey College.

The following is a summary of the distinguishing

tenets of the Hopkinsians, together with a few of the reasons they bring forward, in support of the sentiments.

I. That all true virtue, or real holiness, consists in disinterested benevolence. The object of benevolence is universal being, including God and all intelligent creatures. It wishes and seeks the good of every individual, so far as is consistent with the greatest good of the whole, which is comprised in the glory of God, and the perfection and happiness of his kingdom. The law of God is the standard of all moral rectitude or holiness. This is reduced into love to God, and our neighbor as ourselves; and universal good-will comprehends all the love of God, our neighbor, and ourselves, required in the divine law, and therefore must be the whole of holy obedience. Let any serious person think what are the particular branches of true piety; when he has viewed each one by itself, he will find that disinterested friendly affections, is its distinguishing characteristic. For instance, all the holiness in pious fear, which distinguishes it from the fear of the wicked, consists in love. Again: holy gratitude is nothing but good-will to God and our neighbor, in which we ourselves are included; and correspondent affection, excited by a view of the good-will and kindness of God. Universal good-will also implies the whole of the duty we owe to our neighbor, for justice, truth, and faithfulness, are comprised in universal benevolence; so are temperance and chastity. For an undue indulgence of our appetites and passions is contrary to benevolence, as tending to hurt ourselves or others, and so opposite to the general good, and the divine command, in which all the crime of such indulgence consists. In short, all virtue is nothing but benevolence acted out in its proper nature and perfection; or love to God and our neighbor, made perfect in all its genuine exercises and expressions.

II. That all sin consists in selfishness. By this is meant an interested, selfish affection, by which a

person sets himself up as supreme, and the only object of regard; and nothing is good or lovely in his view, unless suited to promote his own private interest. This self-love is in its whole nature, and every degree of it, enmity against God: it is not subject to the law of God, and is the only affection that can oppose it. It is the foundation of all spiritual blindness, and therefore the source of all the open idolatry in the heathen world, and false religion under the light of the Gospel; all this is agreeable to the self-love which opposes God's true character. Under the influence of this principle, men depart from truth; it being itself the greatest practical lie in nature, as it sets up that which is comparatively nothing above universal existence. Self-love is the source of all profaneness and impiety in the world, and of all pride and ambition among men, which is nothing but selfishness, acted out in this particular way. This is the foundation of all covetousness and sensuality, as it blinds people's eyes, contracts their hearts, and sinks them down, so that they look upon earthly enjoyments as the greatest good. This is the source of all falsehood, injustice, and oppression, as it excites mankind by undue methods to invade the property of others. Self-love produces all the violent passions; envy, wrath, clamor, and evil speaking; and everything contrary to the divine law is briefly comprehended in this fruitful source of all iniquity, self-love.

III. That there are no promises of regenerating grace made to the doings of the unregenerate. For as far as men act from self-love, they act from a bad end: for those who have no true love to God, really do no duty when they attend on the externals of religion. And as the unregenerate act from a selfish principle, they do nothing which is commanded: their impenitent doings are wholly opposed to repentance and conversion; therefore not implied in the command to repent, &c. so far from this, they are altogether disobedient to the command. Hence it appears, that there are no promises of salvation to the doings of the unregenerate.

IV. That the impotency of sinners, with respect to believing in Christ, is not natural, but moral; for it is a plain dictate of common sense, that natural impossibility excludes all blame. But an unwilling mind is universally considered as a crime, and not as an excuse, and is the very thing wherein our wickedness consists. That the impotence of the sinner is owing to a disaffection of heart, is evident from the promises of the Gospel. When any object of good is proposed and promised to us upon asking, it clearly evinces that there can be no impotence in us with respect to obtaining it, beside the disapprobation of the will; and that inability which consists in disinclination, never renders any thing improperly the subject of precept or command.

V. That, in order to faith in Christ, a sinner must approve in his heart of the divine conduct, even tho God should cast him off forever: which, however, neither implies love of misery, nor hatred of happiness. For if the law is good, death is due to those who have broken it. The Judge of all the earth cannot but do right. It would bring everlasting reproach upon his government to spare us, considered merely as in ourselves. When this is felt in our hearts, and not till then, we shall be prepared to look to the free grace of God, through the redemption which is in Christ, and to exercise faith in his blood, *who is set forth to be a propitiation to declare God's righteousness, that he might be just, and yet be the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus.*

VI. That the infinitely wise and holy God has exerted his omnipotent power in such a manner as he purposed should be followed with the existence and entrance of moral evil into the system.—For it must be admitted on all hands, that God has a perfect knowledge, foresight, and view of all possible existences and events. If that system and scene of operation, in which moral evil should never have existed, was actually preferred in the Divine mind, certainly the Deity is infinitely disappointed in the

issue of his own operations. Nothing can be more dishonorable to God than to imagine that the system which is actually formed by the divine hand, and which was made for his pleasure and glory, is yet not the fruit of wise contrivance and design.

VII. That the introduction of sin is, upon the whole, for the general good. For the wisdom and power of the Deity are displayed in carrying on designs of the greatest good; and the existence of moral evil has undoubtedly occasioned a more full, perfect, and glorious discovery of the infinite perfections of the Divine nature, than could otherwise have been made to the view of creatures. If the extensive manifestations of the pure and holy nature of God, and his infinite aversion to sin, and all his inherent perfections, in their genuine fruits and effects, is either itself the greatest good, or necessarily contains it, it must necessarily follow that the introduction of sin is for the greatest good.

VIII. That repentance is before faith in Christ. By this is not intended that repentance is before a speculative belief of the being and perfections of God, and of the person and character of Christ; but only that true repentance is previous to a saving faith in Christ, in which the believer is united to Christ, and entitled to the benefits of his mediation and atonement. That repentance is before faith in this sense, appears from several considerations. 1. As repentance and faith respect different objects, so they are distinct exercises of the heart; and therefore one not only may, but must be prior to the other. 2. There may be genuine repentance of sin without faith in Christ, but there cannot be true faith in Christ without repentance of sin; and since repentance is necessary in order to faith in Christ, it must necessarily be prior to faith in Christ. 3. John the Baptist, Christ and his apostles, taught that repentance is before faith. John cried, *Repent, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand*; intimating that true repentance was necessary in order to embrace the gospel of the king-

dom. Christ commanded, *Repent ye, and believe the Gospel*: And Paul preached *repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ*.

IX. That tho men became sinners by Adam, according to a divine constitution, yet they have and are accountable for no sins but personal; for, 1. Adam's act, in eating the forbidden fruit, was not the act of his posterity; therefore they did not sin at the same time he did. 2. The sinfulness of that act could not be *transferred* to them afterwards, because the sinfulness of an act can no more be transferred from one person to another than an act itself. 3. Therefore Adam's act, in eating the forbidden fruit, was not the *cause*, but only the *occasion* of his posterity's being sinners. God was pleased to make a constitution, that, if Adam remained holy through his state of trial, his posterity should in consequence be holy also; but if he sinned, his posterity should in consequence be sinners likewise. Adam sinned, and now God brings his posterity into the world sinners. *By* Adam's sin we are become sinners, not *for* it; his sin being only the *occasion*, not the *cause* of our committing sins.

X. That tho believers are justified *through* Christ's righteousness, yet his righteousness is not *transferred* to them. For, 1. Personal righteousness can no more be transferred from one person to another, than personal sin. If Christ's personal righteousness were transferred to believers, they would be as perfectly holy as Christ: and so stand in no need of forgiveness. 3. But believers are not conscious of having Christ's personal righteousness, but feel and bewail much indwelling sin and corruption. 4. The scriptures represent believers as receiving only the *benefits* of Christ's righteousness in justification, or their being pardoned and accepted for Christ's righteousness' sake: and this is the proper scripture notion of imputation. Jonathan's righteousness was imputed to Mephibosheth when David shewed kindness to him for his father Jonathan's sake.

The Hopkinsians warmly contend for the doctrine

of the divine decrees, that of particular election, total depravity, the special influences of the Spirit of God in regeneration, justification by faith alone, the final perseverance of the saints, and the consistency between entire freedom and absolute dependence; and therefore claim it as their just due, since the world will make distinctions, to be called Hopkinsian Calvinists.

DISSERTATIONS ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT. NO. 2.

The doctrine of man's moral accountability to his Maker, is an idea which few or none pretend to dispute. We believe it is equally as important, as it is indisputable. By this doctrine is tried the moral tendency of religious theories; and their importance, or want of importance, may be accounted in proportion, as they are calculated to strengthen, or weaken, a sense of moral accountability to God. Now it is evident that an accountable state always presupposes a time of rendering account; hence, as might naturally be expected, we read in the Bible of "the day of judgement," "the judgement-seat of Christ," and other expressions of a similar meaning. That man possesses certain powers of agency, that he is capable of abusing, but is required to do otherwise, I think is likewise inferable from the idea of a moral accountable state. Whether the conclusion necessarily follows from such a state or not, it is plain that such is the condition of man, and such the principle on which he acts. We gather, therefore, from these ideas, that if man be a subject of suffering or punishment now—as all grant he is—he must continue to be such a subject, till the judgement of the present period, or state of his accountability, is brought to a close. We see no proper means by which such a judgement can be brought to a close, till the responsible person has rendered a proper account for the last moral actions of his life, or the last actions of the present period of his accountability.

From these considerations we gather an argument in favor of the doctrine of future punishment. For as the time of rendering account must be posterior to the actions for which a person is made responsible, it necessarily follows that an account rendered for the last moral actions in life, must be in a state beyond the present, or not at all. And as trial or judgement clearly implies, in the subject, an imperfect state, it argues thus much in favor of the doctrine for which we contend.

An attempt to avoid the force of this argument, by stating that judgement to be future to moral actions, could never take place, because men may be supposed to be accountable to their Maker during eternity, has little force when we consider, that any person amenable to a law, may be called at any particular period to answer for actions that are past, and still remain accountable. But when men cease to be vile, there will be no occasion to judge them for committing sin.

What now remains a subject of examination, is, how, in denying a future judgement, men may be supposed to be judged according to their works. Are all people, in this life, brought to all the judgement they need to expect, and are condemned or approved for every action, according to their works? It may be proper that we exercise some care in considering this question, for a proper answer must very materially affect the grand object of our discussions. The affirmative of this question must be maintained, or the doctrine of no future punishment cannot be supported. It is commonly said by our opposers on this subject, that God has fixed the sting of transgression in the act; and therefore renders to them their desert, in the guilt of their transgression, and the proportionate exclusion from virtuous enjoyment. But where is the tribunal to which men are brought and judged in this life? Will it be said to be any other than conscience that accuses or else excuses men in their moral conduct? Should we be asked if this is not enough, we answer, no. The conscience itself, if we read cor-

rectly, is sometimes *defiled, seared with a hot iron, and is evil*. The conscience that is *purged from dead works*, must have previously been much incapacitated, for the proper and last tribunal of moral actions. Who could expect a correct decision in all cases, from a corrupt judge? and shall we look to a defiled conscience as the last and only tribunal by which the actions of men are to be tried?

Should we grant that men were brought to the tribunal of conscience for all their transgressions, which we have already found cannot be wholly true, we still meet with difficulty in reconciling the idea with those passages that speak of a day of judgement. On the hypothesis we are now considering, we must suppose the day of judgement to be a man's whole lifetime, and the reproofs of conscience to be such as he naturally experiences in that time. When Christ said, "For every idle word that men shall speak they shall give account thereof in the day of judgement," there is no doubt but he meant to impress a solemn truth on the mind, which should awaken a more keen and stricter sense of moral accountability. But if this and similar expressions are to be resolved into that which the common occurrences of the day afford, it is telling the abandoned wretch that he may expect to experience similar stings of conscience as formerly, which, notwithstanding his inclination to scepticism, he never doubted. It is likewise telling him, by an unavoidable implication, that if he can elude human authority, he need not expect any other judgement of God than what he all along experiences, which is exactly the very thing he wants.

It is argued with much plausibility that sin contains that in its nature and consequences, which is sufficient to deter any one from the practice of it. But we oppose this idea by the testimony of visible facts. Old sinners still continue to sin, and find nothing in their experience, that dissuades them from the practice. This remark, however, we do not consider wholly without exceptions. If men's feelings

were always alive to a proper sense of virtue, we believe the idea of sin which we now oppose would be universally true ; but this evidently is not the case. "Men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil, *hateth* the light." There is that deception in iniquity, that however odious it may be to those that practise righteousness, it embraces those that commit it with the enticing charms of a lover. Are we then to look to the very darkness which men love, as containing a full and equal punishment for their transgressions ? Is this the whole "chastening of the Lord, that yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness to them that are exercised thereby ?"

We find that men are generally in *love* with iniquity, much in proportion to their practice of iniquity. And altho we grant that the love of iniquity is founded on deceptive principles, and the promised happy consequences are a cheat to the soul ; yet they are such as flatter the sinner, and are, by no means, calculated to dissuade him from pursuing his accustomed course. Would a person be apt to account that which he loves as a punishment ? No ; nor would it, properly speaking, have the effects of a punishment on the mind, till he is enabled to realize its chastening power. The argument, then, that sin does not, in many instances, carry with itself the reward of its full demerit, appears fully supported from the nature of the case. It of course requires a punishment other than its own immediate effects and the loss of virtuous enjoyment. Did we suppose the opposite idea true, we could not account for the prolongation of sufferings for crimes, in the numerous instances in which we find them related. In the instance of Joseph's brethren's selling him to strangers, who carried him to Egypt, we find they were made sufferers for their crime, years after the transactions took place. Nor does it weaken the force of this argument, tho it be substantiated that they felt a compunction of conscience at the time of transgression.

Solomon says, "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men are fully set in them to do evil," Eccl. viii. 11. But it would seem that the plan of the sentiments we oppose, would not admit any delay of execution. Its abettors found one of their principal reasons against it on the consideration that the threatening of a future punishment cannot have a salutary effect on the mind. That the wicked are disposed to take liberties from lenient favors, is a position that does us no injury to allow; but it argues nothing against the execution of a proper punishment in due time.

On the subject of man's accountability, there is one idea that appears clearly attested, both by scripture and human experience, which opposes the notion that every sin is attended by its immediate, proportionate sting of conscience, and receives in the present tense, its due portion of suffering and punishment. The feelings of men are alive to conviction for sin, much in proportion to the general exercise of their minds in virtuous habits and good principles. The wretch that has long devoted himself to wickedness, experiences less remorse at the perpetration of crimes, than the mere novice, who is beginning to travel his unaccustomed road of darkness. This is an idea, which, no doubt, our opposing brethren will be unwilling to allow us; for they cannot but see that the allowance must sap the foundation of their sentiments of proportionate punishment attached to every crime, and a proportionate sense of guilt to every sin. But we do not expect to convince, by an appeal to human experience, those whose sentiments, as we conclude, do not allow them to draw just inferences from such experience. We would therefore cite a few passages of scripture with reference to this point. See Jer. vi. 13, 14, 15.—"From the prophet even unto the priest every one dealeth falsely. They have healed also the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly, saying, Peace, peace; when there is no peace. Were they

ashamed when they had committed abomination? *no*, they were not at all ashamed, neither could they blush." What language could better express our ideas than this? Had they experienced remorse or compunction for sin, would they not have been ashamed? But the divine testimony says, "They were *not* at all ashamed." It appears they justified themselves in their abominations, and in crying, *peace, peace*, when there was no peace. Did they receive their punishment then? It appears not. But they were to receive it at an appointed time. "Therefore," says the word, "they fall among them that fall; *at the time* that I visit them they shall be cast down, saith the Lord."

In Ezek. viii. 12, we find it stated that the ancients of the house of Israel say, "The Lord seeth us not; the Lord hath forsaken the earth." Our readers cannot suppose, from this passage, that their feelings were alive to a due sense of accountability to God.

We cannot tell how the conscience of the fool that hath said in his heart, "There is no God," is now convicting him of sin against God. We do not understand how those that were given over to a reprobate mind to do those things which are not convenient, because they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, were rendering their Maker that account which he requires. If it might be said, they were *receiving* that recompence of their error that was meet, it was not saying they *had* received it.

St. Paul says, "Thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them that do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgement of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?"—Rom. ii. 3, 4. Here it appears that because some people do not experience the judgement of their crimes, they flatter themselves that they may escape them. If in reply, it be said, this is their mistake, they do experience the judgement, we answer, that we cannot con-

ceive how any thing can be a judgement to a man of which he possesses no consciousness. Besides, the aforementioned text speaks of God's *forbearance*, which we cannot reconcile with the doctrine of immediate punishment in all cases without exception.

Matt. xxviii. 19.—*Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

THE word *name*, by a Hebrew idiom, is often redundant. The phrases, *name of God*, *name of the Lord*, express no more than God and Lord. "I will praise the name of God with a song," i. e. "I will praise God with a song," Ps. lxxix. 30. "The name of the Lord is a strong tower," Prov. xviii. 10. "Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever," Dan. ii. 10. "I will cut off the name of the Chemarims," Zeph. i. 4. In all these examples, the word *name* is redundant, and might be omitted without affecting the sense.

In other cases the *name* of any person signifies the *authority* or *doctrine* of that person. "I am come in my Father's name," John v. 43; that is, by the authority of my Father. "In the name of Jesus rise up and walk," Acts iii. 6; that is, by the authority of Jesus Christ. "By what power or name have ye done this?" iv. 7, or, "by what power or authority have ye done this?" St. Paul says, "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth," xxvi. 7; that is, contrary to the *authority* or *doctrine* of Jesus of Nazareth. "In his name (authority or doctrine) shall the Gentiles trust." Matt. xii. 21.

It hence follows, that being "baptized into the name" of any *person*, is the same as being baptized into the doctrine of that person; or into the person himself. This is what is consistent with what is stated in other places. "For as many of you as have been *baptized into Christ*, have put on Christ," Gal. iii. 27. "Know

ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death ?" Rom. vi. 3. "They were all baptized unto (into) Moses in the cloud," 1 Cor. x. 2.

To be baptized into the name of the Holy Spirit does not imply that this spirit is a person, any more than that death is a person for the same reason. And if to be baptized into Christ, be a proof that he is equal with God, you may infer the same of Moses.

In the words immediately preceding this 19th verse Jesus said, "All power is given to me." On the ground of this derived power, he sent the apostles to teach and baptize. Was it possible for them to think that he, who plainly declared he received all his power from God, could himself be God, could himself be perfectly equal with the Great Being who gave him all the power he possessed, yea, that he was that Being?

Baptizing in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, simply means, initiating the disciples, by that rite, into the christian religion, as originating with the Father, made known by the Son, and confirmed by the miraculous gifts of the Spirit.

It does not appear that the apostles understood the words in the communion as a form to be used in the administration of baptism ; for there is no proof that they ever so used them ; on the contrary, we are informed, that they baptized in the name of Christ, or in the name of the Lord Jesus, (See Acts ii. 38 ; and viii. 16, and x. 48, and xix. 5.) They must have understood this to amount to the same thing as baptizing in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. That it was baptizing them into the christian religion. Those who were baptized were said to put on Christ ; they took upon them his name, the profession of his gospel.

Sparks and Wright.

From the Christian Register.

MR. REED—I do not recollect that I have seen in my late work on the Trinity, a particular explanation of that passage of Isaiah, which is considered by Trinitarians as a prophecy relating to our Savior, unanswerably proving his divinity. I refer to Isa. ix. 6. Of all the passages of Scripture which have been cited to prove the above mentioned doctrine, I know of none that has been a greater stumbling-block to humble inquirers after the truth, than the one to which I refer. I confess that when arguing on the text, I have never yet been able to give my opponent a reply which was satisfactory to myself.

My object in addressing you is to obtain, either from yourself or some one of your correspondents, an exposition of this text. By complying with this request, you will confer a favor on one of your constant readers, and one who ardently desires to obtain a knowledge of the truth.

G. D.

In reference to the above request, we subjoin an extract from the Rev. Mr. *SPARKS' Letters on the Ministry, Ritual, and Doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church.*

"A prominent text" (says Mr. Sparks) "which you bring forward in proof of the supreme divinity of Christ, is the noted one in Isaiah ix. 6. 'For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.' Such are the words as you have quoted them, and as they stand in the common version of the Bible. But it was hardly to be expected that this text would be quoted at the present day without a word of comment or explanation, to let it be known that its most important parts are, at best, a very doubtful, and probably a false rendering of the original.

"The prophecy, in this passage, undoubtedly alludes to the Messiah; and, consequently, the titles which

it contains are to be applied to him. The only question is, whether the titles, or names which were adopted by king James' translators, have the same meaning as those which were originally written by the prophet? This can be ascertained only by a critical examination into the meaning of the original words, aided by a profound knowledge of the language in which they were written, and of the ancient translations. Such an examination has been repeatedly made by the most learned men of different religious sentiments, who have almost unanimously concurred in a result which proves the rendering of our common version to be more or less defective. Is it dealing fairly, therefore, with those who have not the means of information to represent this text as of undoubted authority in its present literal meaning? Should they not, at least, be told what they are to receive with implicit confidence, and what with caution? Is it justifiable thus to confound truth with error, and to give countenance to popular prejudice, by making the scriptures speak what their writers never intended?

It is not denied that commentators have found much difficulty in this text, on account of the ambiguity of some of the Hebrew words; yet they almost universally agree in giving it a meaning different from the one retained in our English version.

"The application of the two first titles is sufficiently obvious; and there seems to have been very little difference of opinion about them, except in the judgment of some critics they ought so to be united, and of others, to be taken separately. But whether they should be read *Wonderful* and *Counsellor* or *Wonderful Counsellor*, is of little consequence in regard to the general meaning and application of the terms.—Our Savior might justly be called *wonderful*, in the astonishing works he performed; and a *counsellor* or a *wonderful counsellor* in the admirable system of religion he has published to the world; in its doctrines, precepts, admonitions, directions, and promises; giving evidence that he was aided, instructed, and empowered from above.

"The next title, THE MIGHTY GOD, is allowed to be a false translation, altho there have been various opinions in regard to the exact import of the original. Le Clerc, who was a trinitarian, and as profound a scholar in biblical learning, perhaps, as any other person, renders the passage thus: '*Wonderful, Divine Counsellor, Mighty.*' Christ was a *divine counsellor* in having derived all his counsels and precepts from God; he was *mighty* in the miracles he performed, and the divine power he possessed.*

"The fourth title, EVERLASTING FATHER, is translated by Bishop Lowth, 'The Father of the everlasting age,' and by Grotius, 'Father of the future age,' or 'of the age to come.' This was strictly appropriate to Christ. He was the founder of a new dispensation, and of a pure and holy religion. He was the head of the church, and came to bestow the means of salvation on mankind, and to confer inestimable benefits, which should continue through all ages.†

* "The principal difficulty, in this passage, seems to have arisen from the doubtful meaning of the word AL, which is sometimes rendered *God*, sometimes *ruler*, or *magistrate*, and is sometimes used in the sense of an adjective to denote excellence or distinction," as AREZI AL, divine cedars—HERERI AL, divine mountains.

"This latter sense is preferred by Le Clerc." He translates AL as meaning *divine* or *excellent*, and connects it with the word translated *Counsellor*, and not with the one translated *mighty*.—To call him Divine counsellor, agrees with what was said of him in Isa. xi. 2, "The spirit of counsel and might shall rest upon him."

"There is much suspicion that the word AL was not written in the original Hebrew, as there are no corresponding words in either of the ancient Greek versions of the Seventy, Æquila, Symmachus, or Theodotian."

† "The original words ABI OED, literally translated, mean *Father of the age*. They are rendered by Le Clerc *Pater perpetuus*, because as he says, Christ is the perpetual or everlasting father of all who shall believe in his religion.

"Grotius translates them *Father of the future age*. This *future age* is the christian dispensation. Christ was the father of this dispensation, in as much as it was established through his

"The application of the last title no one can mistake. He was eminently the *prince of peace*, in giving a religion to the world, whose direct tendency is to promote peace among men.

"Such are the renderings which the most able critics have given of this text. They are such as the original easily receives, and such as are peculiarly applicable to the character of Christ, as it was exhibited in his life and religion. The text, thus explained, gives no support to the doctrine of the supreme divinity of Christ, and contains nothing more than several titles and epithets prophetically applied to him, and expressive of the character which he actually sustained. The translation may be expressed in the following terms: "And his name shall be called Wonderful, Divine Counsellor, Mighty, Father of the age to come, Prince of Peace." These results are drawn, it must be remembered, from the critical expositions of Trinitarians.

"Even admitting the received translation to be correct, it does not prove Christ to be the Supreme God. We have already seen that the title God was often applied to other persons by way of distinction besides Christ, even to all to 'whom the word of God came.' It may certainly be given, therefore, with great propriety to him, who was appointed a special messenger of the counsels and will of Jehovah, and who is exalted above all principality, and power, and dominion. Hence if the name be translated *God*, it cannot be accounted a proof of the supreme divinity of Christ. But I do not wish to vindicate this rendering, as the voice of criticism is decided against it."

instrumentality, by the exercise of such powers as were communicated to him by Jehovah, and also to his apostles in such a degree as to convince men of its truth and authority."

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM E. TURNER, DATED
CHARLESTOWN, JUNE 26, 1823.

"My difficulties with the editors remain in statu quo. Brother Dean however has lately settled with Mr. Ballou, and the settlement embraces both their personal and public difficulties. They have exchanged papers, purporting that each considers the other "a Christian Minister, and in the fellowship of the gospel." This settlement was made at the meeting of the Southern Association at Stafford, Con. Mr. Ballou made the first advances to settle. They made their adjustment in private, and nothing is to be given to the public except as some may occasionally read the papers which have passed between them. I have waited upon Mr. Ballou, and attempted a settlement in the same way, but was denied.—You will remember that, not long since, the Junior editors informed the public, that they had no right to make a distinct settlement."

From the Universalist Magazine.

THE BROKEN AGREEMENT OF THE JUNIOR EDITORS OF
THE UNIVERSALIST MAGAZINE AND THE AUTHORS OF
THE APPEAL TO THE PUBLIC.

March 15, 1823.

Whereas some of our brethren inform us that they have told several persons in different places that *we, the subscribers, had made an adjustment of our difficulties with the Authors of the "Appeal to the public," and that we were about to publish, in the Universalist Magazine, an agreement between ourselves and the Authors;* and as those brethren who have given this information apprehend that some damage may accrue to themselves thereby, unless an explanation be presented to those whom they have thus informed,—we think it due to them to give the following PUBLIC NOTICE, VIZ.

That on the 18th ult. *we, the subscribers, and Authors of the "Appeal to the Public"* did sign a mutu-

al agreement, and agree that the agreement, in the form of a *public notice*, should be published in the Universalist Magazine of Feb. 22d ; but that the agreement was *not* published, because we, the subscribers, afterwards withdrew our names from it for the following reasons, viz.

1. We discovered, on reconsideration, and also by additional information received immediately after signing it, that the statements in that agreement were not true.

2. The Editors had before entered into a mutual understanding that we would not publish any thing relative to the "Appeal to the Public" without the consent of all the Editors ; and as the senior Editor was *not* present at the making of said agreement, we were satisfied on reflection that we *alone* had no right to agree to the publication of such a *notice*.

HOSEA BALLOU, 2d.

THOMAS WHITEMORE.

THE UNIVERSALISTS CONTEND AMONG THEMSELVES.

The Universalists contend among themselves, says an opposer ; this proves what we have always told them, that their doctrine is very licentious. But who is this man that is throwing stones ? You doubtless remember what our Lord told the Pharisees concerning the woman, *He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her*. Brother Baptist, have you never had any difficulty in your Associations ? Will you say it ? No, you cannot. You have had many difficulties. We mention the circumstance, that there are many kinds of baptists as a proof of what we state. Brother Methodist, have you any stones to throw ? As much as you hold to piety and zeal, there are some who think they are better in some respect than their other brethren ; of course we have heard of *Reformed* Methodists. What says brother Congregationalist about stoning us ? Are you able according to

our Lord's permission thus to bruise us? You are sensible that a very large body of your general connexion have become Unitarian, and you have been disposed to have no small contention with them. In short, the history of your proceedings afford many instances of differences. But it is useless to particularize further; for we know not who can plead an exemption from similar troubles.

Let that denomination of Christians who never had troubles of a similar nature to ours, stone us, and we will not say a word. We will be as patient as a lamb led to the slaughter, or as a sheep before her shearers, which is dumb.

While many of our enemies suppose us much allied to infernal powers, some of our friends would have it that we possess an angelic nature that lifts us above the sphere of human folly. While the one exults in our misfortunes, the other is sorely disappointed in his calculations. Those who would consider us gods, are generally extremely afraid of the enemy. They seem to think he has the advantage of us, because we act more like men than like gods, some of us, like very foolish men too. But what denomination has any advantage of us on this ground? We say, let them pull the beam out of their own eyes, before they undertake to meddle with the mote—or if you please, the beam—that is in ours.

Men frequently act from motives of self interest, pride, &c. and will, while man is man, so act, let them belong to what society or denomination they may. Among the Apostles themselves, notwithstanding their intimate acquaintance with our Lord, there were some differences, and, on a certain occasion, Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation.

We understand Br. *Fearful* has concluded not to take the Christian Repository, because he says he will not have a book that he is ashamed to lend to his neighbors.—What is the trouble, my brother? There is so much contention among the brethren. For my part, continues Br. *Fearful*, I had much rather they

would write against other denominations than against one another. In reply we observe, we do not wish for any better contention with ANY one. We may be too extravagant in opposing the errors of other denominations as well as those of our own. They are entitled to respect for their learning and piety. As it respects our own denomination, it is certainly a matter against us that we have contentions. We are sensible they are calculated to blunt the finest feelings of fraternal affection, and nourish the root of bitterness, instead of love, harmony, and peace. But if this be our lot, let us endure with patience, *knowing tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope*, through the love of God shed abroad in the heart.

We have made it a general rule not to invite controversy, and wish for no other than that which is of the calmest and most deliberate kind. But unfortunately for us as well as the reader, we have been called to submit to that which is very corroding to our feelings. But we considered it good policy not to exclude those communications, altho we were aware beforehand, they might tend to some personal damage. The subject was of too long standing and too obdurate in its nature, to be covertly *hushed* into silence. It required purgation by a more open exposure.

If by the trial of these difficulties, it is found that we possess more wickedness, malice, envy, cowardice and stubbornness, than we have heretofore supposed, the world will lose nothing by the exposure; for they will then know what kind of people we are, and, of course, will be able to treat us according to our characters.

From the Unitarian Miscellany.

THE GRAVE OF LAZARUS.

EVERY reader of the gospel, however superficial, must have had his attention arrested, at some time, by the sublime and affecting story of the resurrection of Lazarus. For the family to which this young man be-

longed, composed, as it would seem, of himself and his two sisters, our Lord evidently felt a strong and ardent affection. At length, Lazarus, who appears to have been the principal support of the family, was taken sick and died. Jesus, who was always the friend of the afflicted, being at a distance from Bethany, the residence of his bereaved friends, went immediately to pay them a visit of condolence, intending moreover to make it the occasion of a stupendous miracle, which should gladden their hearts by restoring to them their brother, and at the same time demonstrate to them his own claim to the Messiahship.

The conversation which took place between the sister of the deceased on the one hand, and their affectionate friend and Savior on the other, at the time of their meeting, is the most touching, and at the same time, the most natural that can be conceived. It shews how full of grief were the hearts of these affectionate females for the death of their brother, and how full of sympathy was the heart of Jesus for the affliction of his friends. It shews, moreover, clearly enough, that they confided in him, not as a common friend, but as possessing qualities of a most extraordinary character; and it discovers on his part a degree of tenderness and authority, which proves that their confidence in him was not excessive.

It is an incident of peculiar interest in the narrative, that our Lord justified the weeping of his friends by indulging in tears himself; and then he immediately changed their grief into joy by one authoritative command, which loosened the bands of death, and delivered this tenant of the sepulchre from his dominion. *Lazarus, come forth!* How simple, and yet how incomparably sublime! In an instant, he that was dead started from his iron slumber, the eye that had been closed in sepulchral darkness opened upon the light, the tongue that had lately faltered out its dying farewell, was loosed from the bands of silence, the limbs that had been stiffened by the chill of death resumed their vigor, and this affectionate friend came

forth, dressed in the apparel of the grave, to mingle again in the endearments of friendship, and to perform again the duties of life. Reader, let us linger for a moment by this empty sepulchre, and see what we can learn, either of truth or duty.

In the first place, I would ask, could there have been a more decisive proof than was here presented, that Jesus was what he claimed to be, the Son of God? It was a miracle, his enemies themselves being judges, in all respects the most unexceptionable of any which could be performed. Here was no splendid apparatus for carrying on the work of deception; no retreating into obscurity to avoid the observation of the world; no apparent attempt to excite wonder, or gain reputation; nothing of the spirit of worldly complacence or triumph when the miracle was over; in short, there was not a single mark of imposture about it; but all was open as day to the observation, as well of enemies as friends. Moreover, in its very nature, it was such as not to admit of its being counterfeited. That Lazarus was dead, was a fact which none could question; for his friends had closed his eyes, and followed his corpse to the grave several days before. That he was alive again, and that he came forth from the sepulchre at the command of Jesus, was perhaps equally a matter of public notoriety; for it seems there were present enemies as well as friends, when the miracle was performed. If there had not been a divine power dwelling in him, in other words, if he had not been the Son of God, whence this energy in his words, which could awaken even the slumber of the tomb? If you say, that some of the Jews who witnessed this miracle, appear still not to have believed on him; I answer, that this proves nothing of the omnipotence of prejudice. It proves not that there was any thing of a doubtful nature in the manner of its performance, but that the human mind is capable of being brought into such a state, that the light of heaven falls upon it, as the dews of heaven upon the flinty rock; that it may be so strongly

trenched in error and prejudice, that no ray of conviction can ever reach it.

In the next place, this miracle, like all the other works of Jesus, proved his benevolence. For why is it, that he has travelled from a distance to Bethany, and gone with this group of mourners to the grave of their friend, and by an energetic word caused it to give up its dead? It was indeed, as we have seen, to demonstrate that he was the Son of God, by shewing that he had the keys of death and the grave; but along with this sublime object there was combined the gracious purpose of drying up the fountains of sorrow, and giving unutterable joy to the wounded hearts of an afflicted family. And how much of a piece was this with all his other works! Trace him from the manger to the cross, and you will find him always active in the benevolent cause of alleviating human misery; nothing of his divine energy is wasted in acts merely calculated to gratify curiosity. His favorite element seemed to be in the atmosphere of sorrow, where he could dry up the mourner's tears, or cause the blind to see, or the deaf to hear, or the lame to walk. Wherever he went, some trace of his benevolent activity was left behind him, there was some son or daughter of sorrow, who had dropped the mantle of weep, and whose countenance was relumed with the smile of returning joy. On all that he did, and all that he suffered, was most legibly written, "good will to men."

Again, who is there that has any relish for what is most tender and sublime in human conduct, that can be insensible to that memorable incident, recorded with so much simplicity and beauty, that "Jesus wept." He saw his friends weeping, and his own benevolent heart could not withhold its tribute of sympathy. Call this an infirmity of human nature, if you will, it is an infirmity from which no good man would wish to be free; nay, it is not too much to say that even the character of the Savior of the world would not have been perfect without it. Yes, it is

one of the brightest, loveliest features in human nature ; and even the deepest sorrow which it ever occasions has something in it so sublime and hallowed, that it is an almost enviable lot to bear it. At the grave of Lazarus, let the miserable speculations of that dreaming philosophy, which makes the moderate indulgence of human sensibility a weakness, be confounded. Here let the man, who sternly refuses the tribute of a tear for the sorrows of others, or who proudly endeavors to reason down the sympathies, which the God of nature has planted in his bosom, learn that he is opposing the gracious designs of his Creator, and has already instituted a process for changing himself into a brute. No, it is not a weakness to weep, when the hand of affliction presses hard either upon yourself or your friends. You must indeed guard against immoderate sorrow, for that betrays the want of resignation to the will of heaven ; but your tears may fall in profusion, and your heart may even send forth sobs of anguish ; and if any one reproaches you, you may fearlessly plead the example of the Savior of the world. To my mind, I must acknowledge, considering the character of Jesus, that I scarcely know whether there is more of moral grandeur in that sublime and energetic call, which awoke Lazarus from the sleep of death, than in those tears of sympathy which fell upon his grave.

And, finally, may we not learn at the grave of Lazarus a most consoling truth, to carry about with us in this world of sorrow ; I mean the final resurrection of the dead. How can we doubt this, when, besides the actual promise of God that the dead shall be raised, we have here an instance, in which, at the command of Jesus, the sepulchre gave back its victim ; and what is more than all, he who has the keys of death, and who once yielded to his iron dominion, has actually come back from the grave, and thus justified the title which he assumed, as "the resurrection and the life." Let it be strongly impressed upon the heart of the christian, that the same voice which bade

as come forth will hereafter disturb the silence
own grave, and speak into life and vigor his own
ering dust, and cause him to stand forth, en-
d and beautified with the glories of immortality.
, too, he bends in sadness over the spot, where
the remains of his christian friend, and finds
east beginning to throb with sorrowful recollec-
and that last fond look rises to remembrance,
stamped its own image indelibly on his heart,
n let him think that that mouldering body will
nimated, and that friend restored to him, not as
rly, the victim of decay and corruption, but
d with celestial bloom and beauty. And when
vn strength shall have been wasted by disease,
he objects of mortal pursuit shall be fading from
ew, and the thin partition that separates him from
ternal world is about to fall, then again, even
his soul is taking its flight for the communion
raphs, let his faith fasten upon the prospect of a
rection, and let it dwell there, till he is absorbed
e full vision of God.

REPORTS OF THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSALISTS.

The Ministers and Delegates composing the Southern Association of Universalists, convened according to adjournment at the house of Br. Thomas G. Farnsworth, in Stafford, Con. on the 10th of June, 1823. Commenced the labors of session by uniting in solemn and fervent prayer with Br. A. Pickering.

Hosea Ballou was chosen *Moderator*.

Richard Carrique, *Clerk*.

Received a request from the Societies recently formed in Haverhill and Wilbraham, Mass. to be admitted into fellowship with the Association, which request was granted.

Appointed Brs. Richard Carrique, John Bisbe, Jr. and David Pickering, a Committee to receive requests for ordination, matters of fellowship, and to make report thereon to the Association.

Closed the business of the evening with prayer by Br. J. A. Ballou.

Wednesday morning 8 o'clock, assembled agreeable to the

adjournment of the last evening at the house of Br. James Hyde.—Prayer by Br. Thomas Whittemore.

Attended to the arrangements of public services.

Morning.—Introductory prayer, Br. Hosea Ballou, 2d.

Sermon by Br. Jacob Frieze,—1 John iv. 8,—“God is love.”

Concluding prayer by Br. Thomas Whittemore.

Afternoon.—Introductory prayer by Br. Paul Dean.

Sermon by Br. D. Pickering,—Ps. xlii. 11,—“Hope thou in God.”

Concluding prayer by Br. Zelotes Fuller.

Evening.—Introductory prayer by Br. John Bisbe.

Sermon by Br. T. Whittemore,—Acts xxviii. 22,—“But I desire to hear of thee, what thou thinkest; for as concerning this sect, we know that every where it is spoken against.”

Concluding prayer by Br. T. G. Farnsworth.

Convened in Council, and having attended to business of a general nature, closed by uniting in prayer with Br. Paul Dean.

Thursday morning the Council assembled at 8 o'clock. J. J. Flagg addressed the throne of grace.

The Committee appointed to receive requests for ordination or letters of fellowship, report that they had received a request from Br. Z. Fuller for ordination, and from Brs. Lucius R. Farnsworth and William Merse for letters of fellowship, and recommended that the same be severally granted.

The attention of the Association was then called to the consideration of two communications published in the *Christian Repository* for December, 1822—entitled an “Appeal to the world”—and a “Declaration,” having for their authors certain Brethren in fellowship with this Association; which communications indicate a breach of fellowship, and are injurious to the good feelings, and harmony which ought ever to prevail among brethren engaged in one cause, having for the end of their labors, the cultivation of the moral and social virtues; the liberation of the human mind from prejudice and bigotry; and the production in the heart of the spirit of benevolence, philosophy and love.

Voted, That the said “Appeal” and “Declaration” be referred to a Committee of three for their examination; and that they report what notice this Association ought to take of the same. Brs. R. Carrique, J. Bisbe, and J. Frieze, were appointed on this Committee.

Public Service Thursday Morning.

Introductory prayer by Br. D. Pickering.

Sermon by Br. J. Bisbe,—Acts xix. 23,—“Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.”

Concluding prayer, Br. H. Ballou, 2d.

Ordination Services.

Introductory prayer, Br. R. Carrique.

Sermon, Br. H. Ballou,--2 Cor. iv. 5,—"For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake."

Consecrating prayer by Br. J. Flagg.

Charge by Br. R. Carrique.

Right hand of fellowship and concluding prayer by Br. H. Ballou, 2d.

The Committee to whom was referred the consideration of the "Appeal" and "Declaration" made the following report, which was adopted by the unanimous vote of the members of the Association.*

This Association considers it expedient to express this public disapprobation of a DECLARATION and an APPEAL, which appeared in the *Christian Repository* for December, 1822, as they tend to dissolve the bonds of union, by manifesting a disposition in their authors to deprive us of the name and character of christian ministers.

Voted, That Brs. Carrique, Bisbe, and Frieze, be a Committee to write to the brethren who are the authors of the Appeal and Declaration, and make known to them the views entertained by this Association of said communications.

Voted, That Br. R. Carrique prepare the Minutes of the proceedings of this Association, and accompany the same with a Circular Letter; and that he be requested to publish the same in the *Religious Inquirer*, printed in Hartford, Con.

Voted, That the next Association be held in Milford, Mass. on the second Wednesday and Thursday in December next. Closed the business of the session by uniting in praise and thanksgiving with Br. H. Ballou.

HOSEA BALLOU, *Moderator.*

RICHARD CARRIQUE, *Clerk.*

THE PUBLIC CENSURE OF THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION.

Our brethren have fondly anticipated a more hopeful prospect in the state of our affairs, than it seems to be our privilege, at present, to realize. The unhappy difficulty into which we have fallen appears still to stare us with all its horrors. Every effort for reconciliation has only multiplied obstructions, and

* Br. P. Dean had returned to Boston.

tended hitherto to enlarge the wounds that were previously very sore.

Were this subject in a situation in which it could be dropped, your aggrieved brother would neither open his mouth, nor move his pen in any manner of investigation concerning it. But he is now fully persuaded that the labor in which is now engaged, is a duty which he owes to his brethren and to himself, however crossing to the benevolent and social sympathies of christian feelings, or painful to his friends. It has, till the present, been a subject of individual difficulty, but now appears in the Southern Association, in which they have engaged on one side of the question, in a manner that appears unprecedented and unaccountable. This Association has passed a vote of censure on their brethren, of manifesting a disposition to deprive the deniers of future punishment of the name and character of Christian ministers; but they have not instructed their Committee to labor with them, with a view to reclaim them in the least degree. Their Committee are barely to communicate by writing their ecclesiastical censure. Who could suppose that such a procedure could have the least tendency to reconcile the accused aggressors, when the whole scope of the accusation, they had no reason to believe, was any other than a mere subject of dispute. It is well known that the principal accused aggressors are Brs. Turner, Dean, and Wood. It appears from the extract from Br. Turner's letter, that Br. Dean, who we learn from the Minutes attended the Association, the first day of its session, agreed on terms of reconciliation with Br. Ballou, the Moderator of the Association, and senior Editor of the Universal Magazine. The next day, the ecclesiastical censure was passed in Br. Dean's absence, which, for aught they have given the public, equally involves him as the two other brethren, notwithstanding a mutual agreement had taken place, the day before, between him and the principal who was offended.

Having noticed this circumstance, we will now at-

tend to the censure itself, which they appear to found on what is called the Declaration. The articles of this Declaration, which were published in the 3d volume of this work, I will here introduce on account of new subscribers. They are the following :

"1. That, in our opinion, the doctrine of universal salvation, at the commencement of a future state, and that of the final restoration of all men by Jesus Christ, through faith and repentance, are distinct and different doctrines, and are incapable of being reconciled together.

"2. That we consider the former doctrine to be subversive of a just sense of our accountability to God, and the proper distinction between virtue and vice, and, consequently, lessens the motives to virtue, and gives force to the temptations to sin."

It may be proper here to notice, as there now lies a public censure on my brethren, that the above statements were sent to me without the explanatory remarks, and received my assent, as expressive of my sentiments on these subjects ; and did actually receive, in one instance, a modification from my pen. With the Appeal I had nothing to do, and of the explanatory remarks I had no knowledge, till they were sent for the press. Here I take the liberty to state for myself, what no doubt is equally true of my brethren, that I had no idea or disposition, by the above statements, of depriving them of "the name and character of Christians." Neither do I believe the accusation is supportable from the Appeal or Declaration. Finding my brethren censured on this ground, I have no disposition to hide myself, because they would allow me to do it ; for if there is any guilt or blame in this thing, I am one of the aggressors as well as they. And if they are called to suffering on this account, let me have my share ; for it is worth a world to perish in a cause which conscience approves, in comparison with feasting on the riches of deceit, and treading on the ashes of those that would not expose a brother to the shafts of an enemy.

I have no doubt that the Association are indebted to the Statement of the Editors of the Magazine for their censure. See Christian Repository, Vol. III. page 254. The reader that has access to it is requested to examine the whole paragraph, from which I quote the following: "They also say, *repeatedly*, it sets aside the scheme of salvation by Christ." Mark this, reader: "It sets aside the scheme of salvation by Christ!" as well as is "detrimental to the morals of community," and irreconcilable with their own doctrine; and yet they are willing to profess before God and man, to fellowship those who believe and avow it,—to fellowship them as *christian ministers!*"

Now let us turn to page 166 of the same volume, where we find the piece from which they quoted the above remarks. It reads as follows: "Now it requires no great capacity to perceive, that this doctrine sets aside the scheme of salvation by Christ. I here speak of our eternal salvation after death. Christ may, to be sure, be the means of doing considerable good to a number of mankind in this world, by his instructions, &c. but as it respects their future state, his office as a Mediator has no relation."

The reader will here perceive that the Editors of the Magazine have omitted an essential qualification. They have given a general application to what was defined, as having a particular meaning. "Mark this, reader," say they, "*it sets aside the scheme of salvation by Christ!*" Now, reader, if you please, mark another thing, "I speak here of our eternal salvation *after death.*" Do they believe in Christ's saving men after death? No; they do not pretend it. How then can it be made to appear, there is a misrepresentation? Does it not appear they did not like to have us state their sentiments, because they were then seen *naked*, without so much as a figleaf to cover their shame? Having thus mutilated a passage from its general connexion, and in utter violation of the qualifying sentences immediately connected with it, they have proceeded, as tho the field was their own, to all those lacerating

expressions which the reader finds in connection with this subject, in their statement. But, says the reader, do you mean to accuse them of dishonesty? I do not. And altho I cannot say but they were as wicked as Cain, I have no doubt but what it may all be the effect of a blind attachment to their own peculiarities, and the excitement occasioned by opposition. I am entirely willing to impute it to the most charitable cause, and beg of every reader to do it.

Have we attacked the sincerity of their faith? They profess to believe in Christ, and the sincerity of that profession we have never called in question; neither do they pretend it. On this ground they would be entitled to the name of Christians, tho they virtually denied two thirds of its doctrine. Every error in Christianity is virtually denying it, that is, as far as the error extends. But a declaration of this error does, by no means, impeach the character of him who embraces it. He is entitled to retain the name and character of his profession, so long as he retains the sincerity of his faith.

The Editors of the Magazine have introduced the following as a specimen of harshness from Br. Wood's Essay on Future Punishment. "The many gross absurdities to which the doctrine of immediate universal salvation is liable, and the vicious effects which it is calculated to produce, render it a doctrine justly deserving of disapprobation and contempt." That this sentence is severe I am willing to acknowledge, and when we consider Br. Wood's youth* in the ministry at that time, it is no doubt justly censurable.

In a note they confidently ask, "Who can produce so severe and contemptuous an expression as this, in all that has been written against future punishment?" Thus they write as entirely ignorant of any thing like this on their part, or their particular adherents. I will

* It appears from the Minutes, that the Editors of the Magazine were mistaken in the date of Br. Wood's joining the Convention. It was in the year 1815 instead of 1816.

now take the liberty to offer them *one* passage from the 3d volume of the Magazine, page 143, last column, as an equal, if not very superior. "If I have any knowledge of my feelings, I have no disposition to misunderstand or misrepresent the views of my brethren who differ from me in their religious sentiments; but with my limited powers of perception, I cannot conceive of *any other* practical effect, as the *fruit* of the above doctrine," (*future punishment*) "except DOWN-RIGHT HYPOCRISY!" Here we have it *in toto*, and with a very gracious preface. On this subject I will not, at this time, multiply passages; but I can show my brethren, if they wish, from their own publications, where future punishment is represented as *disguised Calvinism*, and without a perceptible shadow of difference, both are pronounced alike *unrighteous* and *cruel*.* *Heathen mythology* and *purgatory* are more than once used as proper descriptive terms of this sentiment, and once have its abettors been published as *mongrel Universalists*. And if this is not enough, I can produce a passage where one has emphatically pronounced the CHRISTIAN doctrine of damnation an *absolute lie*, and entitled to no credit.

On this subject I need not enlarge, nor would I have offered what I have, but from a humble hope that my brethren would open their eyes, and see what they have done, and what they are doing.

Our readers will perceive that there has been once a settlement between the junior Editors of the Magazine and the Authors of the Appeal and Declaration, and was broken up by them, because "the statements," as they say, "in that agreement were *not true*." Notwithstanding this public notice, no charge of falsehood

* The following definition of Calvinism, from a noted editor on their side of this question, in comparison with the above, will give to our views the deepest tinge of iniquity. "If," says he, "it is possible to concentrate all the essence of the most abominable, cruel, unnatural, vile, wicked, diabolical, and outrageously perverse principles in creation, into one common focus, that focus is *Calvinism*!"

lies against those brethren at the Association. Besides how come these Editors to know so much about this matter, when they wrote the statement in answer to the Appeal and Declaration, and afterwards suffer themselves to be so intolerably cheated as to justify them in abandoning their own agreement? Again. Those young editors seem to tell us that they had forgot their duty, till the old gentleman came home, and reminded them; and, as they were under age, mere nominal editors, or something *like it*, the agreement was, by no means, binding.

Should we admit that the Appeal and Declaration were unprovoked, impolitic, and improper; still, it affects not the subject, very materially. The question now before us is, whether they support the public censure of the Southern Association. It is with reference to this idea, that I have endeavored to direct the present discussion. I cannot, therefore, but view the censure as the effect of a strange and unfortunate infatuation; for I cannot yet think that the whole body of the Southern Association would designedly abuse any of their brethren. Charity induces me to conclude that many, in this unfortunate struggle, *know not what manner of spirit they are of*.

My readers will here observe, that in this notice of the public censure of the Southern Association, I have confined myself to what has previously been before the public, with the exception only of the extract from Br. Turner's letter. It likewise may not be improper, tho it may look somewhat bold, to caution the Association in attempting to maintain their censure, to be careful not to use arguments, which we shall be able to turn against some of the brethren that do not believe in future punishment.

It is hoped the brethren will consider this subject with due caution, and take such steps as shall very justly entitle them to the name and character of Christian ministers.

SAMUEL C. LOVELAND.

GOD'S WILL.

Some people tell us that God has two wills, a secret will and a revealed one. The revealed will is, that all men should be saved ; but the secret will is, that some men should be eternally damned. Any person that has the use of his reason, and *dares* to use it, will see at once, that God cannot have two wills in direct opposition to each other. But if the subtle schoolmen have discovered a will, not revealed in God's word, and on this account may be called *secret*, that some men should be miserable to an endless duration, notwithstanding his revealed will is to the contrary, how do they know but what God has another secret will that all men shall be eternally damned ? Surely, if they are unwilling to take his revealed word for it, how can they decide how the matter will prove. If the revealed *will* be no rule to judge of the secret, is it not as likely that God has a secret will of condemnation against the believer, which he has not discovered, as that he should have a secret will against the unbeliever, of which he is ignorant, but the believer has found it out ? Again, if the secret will of God, in all cases, is in direct opposition to his revealed will, as they tell us it is respecting the misery of the wicked, then as his revealed will is, that all should be saved, it follows of consequence that *all* will be DAMNED.

If the secret will of God be the will of decree, and the revealed will a will of command and disposition of mind, it is altogether unaccountable how the secret will of God fixed those decrees, which were contrary to the disposition of the divine mind.

Our all-wise Creator cannot be indifferent of the final destiny of his offspring man. He either wills they all should be saved, or he wills they should not. St. Paul says, "God will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." 1 Tim. ii. 4. Many good people pray for the salvation of all men, and can it proceed from a wicked spirit, that we believe what the pious and benevolent pray for ? No man that is unwilling to have all men saved can pray

the Lord's prayer; because in that we say, *thy will be done*, and what God's will is should ever be remembered.

Christ says, "he came down from heaven not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him." Then Christ came to save all men, for this is the will of God. For this reason he tasted death for *every man*; sent his apostles into *all the world*; and commanded them to preach to *every creature*. All that the Father giveth him, namely, *the heathen for his inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession, shall come to him*, "and him that cometh to me," he says, "I will in no wise cast out."

The prophet Isaiah says, "He shall see of the travail of his soul, *and shall be satisfied*." He that came to do the will of God shall be satisfied. It seems then the will of God must be done. The benevolent Redeemer shall be satisfied! Who can wish for more? Do the gloomy shades of hell surround you? Jesus has the keys. He opens the prison doors, and lets the prisoners go free. He breaks in pieces the gates of brass, and cuts in sunder the bars of iron. He binds up the broken hearted, proclaims liberty to the captives, and comforts all that mourn.

So we learn that if the will of God is not always done now, we may look for the time when it will be. We do not believe that all the prayers of good men for the salvation of their race, all travail of the Redeemer who tasted death for every man, and the extensive will of the supreme God, will be recorded in the archives of heaven, as the everlasting remembrance of failure and defeat. Neither can we believe that he who wills us good, will turn to will us evil; nor he who tasted death for us will cease to love us; nor will the acceptable prayers of the just be lost in everlasting forgetfulness.

MISCELLANEOUS. X

Dedication.—The new Meeting-House in Medway, Mass. built and owned principally by Universalists,

was dedicated to the worship of Almighty God, on the 29th of May last. Sermon by Br. Ballou of Boston.

Installation.—On Monday, June 2d, was installed, as Pastor of the First Universalist Society in this town, the Rev. DAVID PICKERING. Lessons of Scripture were read by Rev. Mr. Fuller of Attleborough—Introductory prayer by Rev. Mr. Killam of Attleborough—Sermon by Rev. Mr. Bisbe of Brookfield—(text, Jeremiah xxiii. 28,) who also offered the installing prayer. The delivery of the scriptures, charge, right hand of fellowship, and concluding prayer, by Rev. Mr. Dean of Boston—Benediction by the Pastor elect. The appropriate and impressive services were interspersed with hymns suited to the occasion, and performed in a manner creditable to the choir. The day was fine; the audience numerous and attentive.

Providence Patriot.

On Wednesday, May 29, Br. BENJAMIN WHITTEMORE was ordained to the pastoral care of the Universalist Society in Scituate, Mass. Brs. H. Ballou, H. Ballou, 2d, S. Stetson, and W. Morse, were present, and each took a part in the services.

May 19, the new Universalist Meeting-House in Shrewsbury, Mass. was solemnly dedicated to the worship of God. In the afternoon, Br. JACOB WOOD was installed as pastor of the Society worshipping in said House. Brs. Dean, Wood, Monroe, Hudson, and Maynard, took part in the exercises.—*Chr. Intel.*

OBITUARY.

DIED at Bernardston, Mass. on the 30th of March, after a very distressing sickness of about four years duration, Mrs. NANCY, wife of Rev. John Brooks, aged 41. The deceased was greatly beloved and respected for her virtues, during life, and died, as she had lived, believing in the universal love of God and salvation of men.—*Inq.*

In Reading, March 29. ROSALIA MARCELLA AMSDEN, daughter of Mr. Asa Amsden, in the fifth year of her age.

In Cumberland, R. I. on the morning of 'the 23d of June, Br. ASA WHEATON, in the 28th year of his age. At the last

General Convention of Universalists, he received a letter of fellowship as a preacher of the gospel.

In Marlow, N. H. Dec. 1st, Mr. LEMUEL MILLER, aged 81 ; and on the 23d of June, his consort, Mrs. MOLLY MILLER, aged 79. Both of these aged servants of God went off the stage of action, with a triumphant faith in Jesus, the Savior of the world ; with an eye on what the law and the prophets had testified of him ; and the cheering hope "which is an anchor of the soul ; sure and steadfast, and entereth into that within the veil."

THE INFANT CALLED AWAY.

Let me go ; for the day breaketh.—JACOB.

Cease here longer to detain me,
Fondest mother, drown'd in woe ;
Now thy kind caresses pain me ;
Morn advances—let me go.

See yon orient streak appearing !
Harbinger of endless day :
Hark ! a voice sad nature cheering,
Calls my new born soul away !

Lately launch'd a trembling stranger,
On the world's wild boisterous flood,
Pierc'd with sorrows, tossed with danger,
Gladly I return to God.

Now my cries will cease to grieve thee,
Now my trembling heart finds rest,
Kinder arms than thine receive me,
Softer pillow than thy breast.

Through this calm and holy dawning,
Silent glides my parting breath,
To an everlasting morning ;
Gently close my eyes in death.

Blessings endless, richest blessings,
Pour their streams upon my heart ;
Tho no language yet possessing,
Yet I speak them ere we part.

ANONYMOUS.

For the Repository.

A POEM ON THE SHORTNESS AND UNCERTAINTY OF
LIFE.

Ah what is life? a flower, a vapor!
 The dew of morning, passing soon!
 Or like the sudden wasting taper,
 Soon out—alas, how short the boon!

Approach with silent grief the mansion,
 Where mortals slumber in the grave;—
 Where now that damsel once so handsome?
 Where now that hero once so brave?

Where now those eyes once sparkling, glancing,
 Diffusing joy on all around?
 Where now that graceful form, enchanting?
 That voice?—in silence—how profound!

What lamentation and what wailing!
 What mourning, struggling and what pain!
 When the grief-worn body's failing,—
 The soul now flies—now comes again!

This life's a shadow, O how fleeting!
 How vain and transient all its joys!
 Its seeming pleasures all retreating,
 Leave but a name of fancied toys.

Then since 'tis but a sleep of error,
 An unavailing imag'd life,
 Let us with wisdom view the mirror,
 And in religion seek relief.

Let us anticipate with pleasure
 A life to come that never ends;
 And in that house lay up our treasure,
 Where we shall meet departed friends.

Where grief and pain have no admission,
 And heavenly pleasure ceaseless reigns;
 Where every soul in true submission,
 Shall praise our God while he remains.

D. S.

CHRISTIAN REPOSITORY.

No. 3.

,OCTOBER, 1823.

Vol. IV.

SERMON, NO. XII.

Matthew xiii. 44. *The kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field, the which when a man hath found he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field.*

These words may require some general explanation, before we proceed to the particulars which they embrace. They are susceptible of the following amplification; "the kingdom of God, which is the gospel in its illuminating and moralizing effects is like a rich treasure in a field, hidden from common observation, and of course not sought after, and perhaps its existence denied or treated as a chimera. But a man, having satisfied himself that a treasure is deposited there, "hideth it," he keeps it secret, he makes no one acquainted with his discovery; and in the joy of his heart, parts with all his possessions, and cheerfully gives up all other considerations, to purchase that field, and thus secure to himself great and permanent wealth."

In no part of divine revelation are we presented with such a variety of images of the kingdom of heaven, as in the parables of the New Testament. It was the intention of our Lord to exhibit his kingdom in every point of view, in which it could be considered; and when he had shown it in one light, he turned it round, or brought the beholder to a different station, and exhibited it in another. It will contribute to our acquaintance with the immediate subject, to run the mental eye along the line of beautiful images, which catch our attention in every parable; as by comparing them, we shall acquire a more extensive knowledge of the object which they resemble, and better determine the use and application of the similes in the text.

"The kingdom of heaven is like leaven, hid in three

measures of meal, till the whole was leavened." This parable describes the gospel in its essential properties and operations. Its qualities are good, capable of diffusion, possessing the power of assimilating and operating in a silent and unseen way, without noise, or disturbance, or ostentation. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. It is not preceded by heralds, crying, 'lo here or lo there.'" Again, "so is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground, and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up he knoweth not how." As the grain progresses in growth, tho nobody sees it grow, so the advances we make in knowledge, as they consist of such minute steps, are only perceivable by the distance gone over. "The kingdom of heaven is like a merchant man seeking goodly pearls, who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had and bought it." There, under the appellation of "kingdom," our Savior describes himself, and points out the design and tendency of his religion, to seek, to improve, and to save the world. "The kingdom of heaven is like a grain of mustard-seed which a man took and sowed in his field; which is indeed the least of all seeds; but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." The operations and effects of moral truth have commenced upon a very small scale; and, of course, the world has been accustomed to think very lightly and diminutively of it. There has been "but a handful of corn in the earth upon the top of the mountain." The flock of the great Shepherd has usually been "a little flock," and they who composed it, have, like Joshua and his fellows, "been men wondered at;" yet this diminutive and despised company "will increase as with the increase of God." The minutest of all seeds will produce a tree, extending its protecting branches in every direction. The "fruit of the handful of corn shall shake like Lebanon." "A little one shall become a thousand,

and a small one a strong nation." Lastly, some parables which present images of the kingdom of God, describe, so to speak, the materials of which it is composed; they define the ground on which the work of moral improvement is predicated. Of this character, is the parable which stands at the head of this discourse.

In discussing the subject before us, we shall, first, inquire, in what respects the kingdom of heaven is like a treasure hidden in a field?

There are two ways in which this metaphor may be explained, and in both it will be found to form a resemblance to the object which it is said to represent. It may be understood as describing the kingdom of heaven to be like a sum of money, deposited in the earth, or like a valuable mine of gold or silver, contained in some field, under the surface of the earth, the existence of which treasure is unknown, except to the man, who sells all that he possesses to purchase the field. How far this method of description accords with real fact, you may be able to judge from a few brief considerations, which will be laid before you. It may occur to you, as it has to me, that the analogy between the two cases is considerable, and deserving our attention. He that buys a field for the sake of the hidden treasure it contains, buys all that appertains to the field; the useless as well as the useful becomes his, the purchaser's property. The man who should make a purchase of this kind, if the soil wore an unpromising appearance; if it was barren, except in briars and thorns, in noxious weeds and poisonous herbs, and if, at the same time, the secret treasure was unknown to all but the purchaser; I say, under such circumstances, the man might naturally enough be called unwise to part with his wealth, for that which is thought to be worth nothing. You scarcely need be told that the gospel was first preached under the most unpromising and appalling circumstances. What must have been the expectations of the founder of the new kingdom, what the calcu-

lations of his few, despised followers, when he and they saw nothing before them but a dreary, barren waste, the thorn instead of the myrtle, and tares instead of wheat? In a word, what animating considerations could attend the contemplation of a world, "dead in trespasses and sins?" These were solemn facts attested by history and experience, yet we are not at liberty to believe, that the Redeemer of the world undertook his work heartlessly, and hopeless of success. We are not to indulge the impious thought, that he had no object, or was ignorant of the means of securing his object. But his object must have been hidden from the common view of mankind. The Savior must have known of the existence of a treasure, which, "for ages and generations had been concealed" from the world. This treasure was his kingdom, his inheritance, "the joy set before him." He said to the people, the "kingdom of God is within you." Who would have expected any thing valuable in such persons as Matthew and Zaccheus, both publicans and sinners," the openly immoral and profane? Yet the address, "come, and follow me," made to one of them, and the declaration, "this day is salvation come to this house," made to the other, brings these persons forth in a new character. The treasure which they contained was exposed, and their relative value to the gospel kingdom fully established. We have been too much habituated to "judge of things after the outward appearance," and hence, we "judge unrighteous judgment." He who "came to seek and to save," "knew what was in man." And tho appearances were most inauspicious, and circumstances most unpromising, yet he exulted in his prospects; "tho Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord; my work is with the Lord, and my recompense with my God."

Again, there is another point in this analogy, that demands attention. The treasure which is contained in the bowels of the earth, must be sought after with labor and toil, and when found, may require the exercise of

skill and judgement, to separate the dross from the precious metal; or if the treasure consist in coin, it may have contracted rust, which will obscure its brightness, tarnish its lustre, and possibly hide the inscription that it bears. "How has the gold become dim, and the most fine gold changed;" yet it is gold still, and retains all its original, intrinsic value. In regard to the first idea, we are certain, that nothing valuable can be obtained without labor. Accordingly we are directed to "dig for wisdom as for hidden treasures." The treasures of the kingdom of heaven can never be obtained, unless we deeply explore the field that contains them. Human nature must be studied, to enable a man to improve or moralize his species; as otherwise he will see no good in man, and of consequence never attempt to develop the good. Successful labor in doing good must depend upon extensive knowledge of the mind, its laws, and operations. Send out a man, who professes to believe, that the world is naturally a mass of sin, and depravity, who, to use common language, has little knowledge of human nature; commission him to convert the wicked, to evangelize the heathen, and like Sterne's traveler, he will pass "from Dan to Beersheba," and return crying, "it is all barren." The truth is, the mine of intellectual wealth has not been opened. Suitable labor has not been employed, or that labor has been ill-directed.

The other points in this analogy are easily made apparent. Man was created in the divine image, which he still bears. But his lustre is dimmed; his moral worth is obscured; the marks of heavenly origin seem to be effaced. But as the pearl needs polishing, to discover its beauties and its value; as coin that has contracted rust, must be burnished, to exhibit its intrinsic value, and as gold in the mine must be separated from the dross, so man needs the operation of his great proprietor's power, he requires the "fire of the refiner," to purify him from defilement, and bring forth the original image of the Deity. A new nature

is not necessary. It is but to remove what is extraneous, the habits, feelings, and desires that man has contracted, and he will be saved with the salvation of God.

But we may view this part of the subject in another light, and that without making an application of the text which will clash with the preceding. There may be a treasure in a field, for which we need not dig deep, for it may be found upon its surface. The soil being tilled, the purchaser will find himself amply remunerated in its productions. To support this application of the parable, it should be considered, that the same soil, which now produces only briars and thorns, may, with suitable cultivation, repay the labor of the husbandman with the choicest and most delicious fruits. It is in this circumstance that the hidden treasure, or secret worth of the field is to be found. An ignorant or inattentive observer would discover no value in the field; and if a man should part with all he had to purchase it, and finally give a great price to obtain it, he would probably call him a fool, supposing that he sacrificed his property for nothing. "This land," he would say, "is in a state of nature; it is unproductive, except of the most useless and deleterious vegetables, nor can any better fruit ever be expected." This, however, is a hasty and premature judgement, formed too much "after the outward appearance." The purchaser would inform the person who held this language, that "no just decision could be formed against future profit, by the present condition of the soil; that unremitting labor and skilful culture never fail of success; that he intends to eradicate every plant but what is useful; that he calculates much upon improvement; that he did not purchase the field for the sake of its present productions; and that being convinced of the good qualities of the soil, he had felt justified in purchasing it, and had not, nor expected to have any cause to repent the bargain he had made."

For several reasons, I am induced to consider this application of the parable as most consistent with the

nature and design of the moral system. Riches, that are dug from the bowels of the earth, may soon vanish. The permanent wealth of nations is obtained from cultivating the earth's surface. Besides, the gospel goes wholly on the ground of improvement. Its riches are not accumulated in a moment. The gospel contemplates a vast series of ages, of dispensations, events, causes, and circumstances, all of which are more or less necessary to its establishment and success. The gospel is progressive in its operations. Its beginnings are small. Its laborers often "sow in tears." They frequently "go forth weeping, though they bear precious seed." They must "have long patience, till they receive the former and the latter rains." Surveying the whole field, we shall find, that the work of improvement progresses, and probably as rapidly as circumstances will permit. But, not unfrequently, the expectations of a glorious harvest are cut off. "Paul may plant and Apollos water, but God only can give the increase." The christian must be willing to wait, "as the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruits of the earth."

We may add, that this application accords with the language of much of the Old and New Testament, in relation to the progress and final establishment of the kingdom of God. "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose; it shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice and sing; the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon. They shall see the glory of the Lord and the excellency of our God." I will plant in the wilderness, the cedar, the shittah-tree, and the oil tree; I will set in the desert the fir-tree, the pine and the box-tree together." "Until the spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted for a forest. Then judgment shall dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness remain in the fruitful field." If it be asked how all this is to be realized; we answer, by regular and continued

improvement, commencing with "rooting up every plant which our heavenly Father hath not planted, breaking up the fallow ground of the heart, and sowing not among thorns;" scattering the seed of the word, and watering it with the rain from heaven, and the dew that gently distils from above. This process will bring forth the treasure which the ignorance and wrongheadedness of man have not permitted him to discover.

The second particular will now be considered. It will consist in showing, that to obtain the treasure of which the text speaks, the purchaser will cheerfully part with present possessions; "he goeth and sell-eth all that he hath, and buyeth that field."

No valuable acquisition can be made without an adequate consideration; and the attainment of a great object will sometimes require great sacrifices. If a man will acquire knowledge, he must forego many of the grosser pleasures of sense, and inure himself to painful studies. The acquisition of wealth is attended with the sacrifice of ease, and frequently of many of the simple, homefelt joys, which the moderate and unambitious most highly prize. The foundation of a kingdom cannot be laid, nor the short lived glory of a conqueror secured, without many personal sacrifices of ease, of quiet, of reputation, and sometimes even of life. In the constitution of things, intelligent beings are so situated, that they can attain scarcely any position of future good, without surrendering many present comforts and conveniences. Even the objects that the gospel presents, tho most freely bestowed by divine bounty, cannot be enjoyed with a high zest of pleasure, unless they cost us exertion and labor. The cross must be suffered, to obtain the crown.

By the man, who sold all he had to purchase the field, we are, undoubtedly, to understand Jesus Christ, because the representation corresponds to him. The Apostle, speaking of our Savior, says, that "tho he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich," and in

another place he represents that he became thus poor, that he might enrich himself. "For the joy set before him he endured the cross and despised the shame." In applying the first of these texts to the present case, it is not necessary to be very critical, and still less to run into the extravagant notions that have been entertained of our Lord's laying aside his divinity, and the glory which he previously possessed. The text shows that Christ was willing to forego worldly considerations, to endure trials, to be slandered and vilified, and finally to meet death, that he might secure the permanent establishment of his kingdom, and exalt his people to thrones of imperishable glory. For this he labored, for this he toiled, for this, "in the form of a servant," he "went about doing good," and for this "he endured the contradiction of sinners against himself." The text expresses as much as this, and it is not necessary to our purpose, that it should express more, or take a more extensive signification.

If the preceding discourse has contributed to assist you in forming any simple and rational ideas of the kingdom of heaven, I shall have cause to be satisfied, that in this respect, I have not "labored in vain." The subject may likewise prove useful in another way; it may furnish a clue to a correct understanding of many other parables of the New Testament, in which we shall find the same subject advanced, tho, as we have already remarked, it may be placed in a different light. It is always important to have this consideration before us, when we look into the parables, as otherwise, "seeing we shall see, and not perceive, and hearing, we shall hear, and not understand."

It is to be recollected, that every christian is a co-worker with his Master in the duties and labors of the kingdom. Accordingly, he must expect, and prepare himself to suffer such sacrifices as the gospel demands, and to surrender whatever, as an heir of the kingdom, he cannot possess. "Buy the truth and sell it not." Our prejudices, prepossessions, and attach-

ments must frequently be given up, if we would "buy the truth." We must be willing to sell all that we have, to gain the treasure of infinitely greater value. In doing this, we suffer no real, eventual loss. The blessings of the kingdom more than compensate for every sacrifice. Its light, its truth, its means of rapid improvement impart the highest satisfaction and the purest joy. In view of these objects, it is well to "count all other things but dross," "that we may win" them. "Seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all things shall be added unto you."

From the (London) Universal Theo. Magazine.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF JOHN WICKLIFF, THE CELEBRATED REFORMER.

Let Cæsar's dues be ever paid

To Cæsar and his throne ;

But consciences and souls were made

To be the Lord's alone.

WATTS.

Every intelligent professor of Christianity knows that the religion of Christ has been corrupted. Ecclesiastical history informs us, that, after the first three centuries had passed away, the State took the system of Jesus under its patronage ; from which period it gradually degenerated into a dark and merciless superstition. Popery overspread the civilized world ; the right of private judgement was annihilated ; and individuals, exercising their common sense in the affairs of religion, were consigned over to the pains of eternal misery. It seemed, at one time, that this thick cloud, which hovered over mankind for ages, would never have been dissipated. But Providence wants not means to accomplish its purposes. JOHN WICKLIFF was the first instrument raised for the divine end of liberating his fellow-creatures from this spiritual captivity. He has, therefore, been emphatically styled, *The Morning Star of the Reformation*

JOHN WICKLIFF was born in the northern part of England, about the year 1324, and received his education at the University of Oxford. According to the taste of the times in which he lived, he became a wonderful proficient in the works of Aristotle, and a complete master of the school divinity. Disgusted, however, with these subtleties, he had recourse to the Scripture itself, and thence imbibed those manly sentiments of religion which were the groundwork of his opposition to the Church of Rome. To his immortal honour be it said also, that whilst he sought after this enlargement of mind, he made proportionable advances in virtue and piety.

The first principal event in the life of Wickliff was the controversy he held respecting the *begging friars*, who had, for some time, infected the University of Oxford. He reprobated their laziness and profligacy. He pointed out the essential difference between their affected humility and that real contempt of worldly goods recommended in the New Testament. His exertions made a great impression on the people, and extended, in no inconsiderable degree, his reputation. Being made Master of Baliol College, and afterward Warden of Canterbury-Hall, he opposed the payment of tribute-money, by which the abettors of popery were highly irritated. A suit respecting his warden-ship was then depending at Rome, and there finally determined against him. Enemies have suggested, that he was urged by revenge to this opposition; but it must be recollected, that it was during the consideration of the business he exerted himself against the pope, so that it is, in reality, an admirable proof of his integrity.

Wickliff was next chosen to fill the divinity chair in Oxford; and he availed himself of this situation to expose the inveterate errors of popery. The clergy, raising a violent clamor against him, instigated the Archbishop of Canterbury to prosecute him: he was, therefore, at length, with some difficulty, deprived and silenced. He was, however, about this time tak-

en up and protected by the Duke of Lancaster; under his patronage he inveighed loudly against existing abuses, and proceeded undauntedly in the cause of reformation. The Duke gave him the valuable rectory of Lutterworth in Leicestershire, whither he repaired and discharged the duties of his station with an exemplary fidelity. From this retreat he was soon drawn forth by fresh prosecutions; but the council, before which he was brought, not agreeing among themselves, he was discharged. On the declension of the Duke's influence he was again exposed to the resentment of his enemies. He was obliged to appear before a Provincial Synod, at Lambeth, where, after having explained several articles of his belief rather equivocally, he was enjoined not to preach any more those doctrines which had been objected to him. So far, indeed, was he from regarding this prohibition, that he went about bare-footed in a long frize gown, preaching occasionally to the people, and without any reserve, in his parish.

Towards the close of the year 1378, Wickliff was afflicted by a violent distemper, which, it was thought, would prove fatal to him. On this occasion, a singular circumstance took place, which ought not to be omitted. Several *begging friars* gained admittance into his chamber, meaning to terrify him by their presence into a retraction of those severe charges which he had formerly made against the order to which they belonged. They assured him that he was about to die, and that such an acknowledgement would prove the means of his salvation. *Wickliff*, surprised at the solemn message, raised himself in his bed, and cried out, "*I shall not die, but live to declare the evil deeds of the friars!!!*" It is said that the friars were driven away in confusion, struck with the sternness of his manner, and the energy of his expressions.

Our great reformer recovered from his indisposition, and undertook the entire translation of the New Testament into the English language, the first of this kind ever undertaken in this country. It appears

that he did not understand the Hebrew language; but collected all the Latin Bibles he could meet with, from them made a correct copy, and then proceeded to the translation. He had previously contended, in a small tract, that the locking up of the Scriptures, in a strange tongue, from the common people, was one of the chief errors of popery; that the Bible contained the whole of God's will; that a good life was the best guide to the knowledge of Holy Writ; and that such a knowledge would make *wise unto salvation*. Thus having paved the way, he ventured to lay his translation before the public. This measure roused, in a most violent manner, the indignation of the clergy. They even brought a bill into Parliament for the suppression of it, alledging that the reading of the Scriptures by the laity opened an alarming prospect of heresy, and that the ruin of all religion would ensue. But the arguments used by the translator and his friends silenced all opposition, and the bill was at length consigned to its deserved oblivion.

Wickliff now ventured a step farther; and attacked the favorite doctrine of the Romish church, *transubstantiation*. In his lectures read at Oxford, as divinity professor, in the year 1381, he contended, that the body and blood of Christ were not substantially in the bread and wine, but that these elements remained the same after consecration.

For this *audacity* he was prosecuted by the Archbishop of Canterbury; but Wickliff was not immediately cited to appear before him, because the primate waited for the consecrated pall from Rome, without which article we presume his righteous anathema could produce no effect. The pall arrived; the heretic was summoned to appear in the monastery of Grey Friars; but he refused to obey the mandate, insisting that he was not under episcopal jurisdiction, being a member of the University of Oxford. The University, it seems, was at that time in his favor, and would have taken up his cause. With this plea the archbishop was obliged to remain satisfied. He,

however, proceeded to condemn his opinions in a council of bishops, who had collected the most obnoxious passages from his writings. At the instant they met, an earthquake shook the floor; the affrighted prelates threw down their papers, crying out that the business was displeasing to Heaven, whilst the bishop chid their superstitious fears, and insisted that it portended the downfall of heresy! Wickliff often spoke pleasantly of this accident, and called the assembly the council of *herydene*; being the old English word for earthquake. A declaration, however, was drawn up, in which the opinions were condemned; to which the reformer replied with singular spirit and ability.

The continued opposition of Wickliff provoked the archbishop to obtain a law against heresy, to which the king, for the purpose of gratifying the clergy, assented. But the people were so dissatisfied with the increase of ecclesiastical power, that it was almost instantly repealed. It was justly urged, that "*Heresy* was an unlimited word, and might bear as wide a construction as a bishop might choose to give it, nor could it be doubted but it would be made to signify whatever the *pride* or *avarice* of the clergy might think expedient.

The archbishop, thus baffled a second time, became so enraged, that he applied for an order to the king whereby he banished all the abettors of Wickliff from the University of Oxford. Succeeding in this measure, the putting it into execution occasioned great noise and confusion. Upon this it is generally supposed that the good old reformer retired from the scene to his living at Lutterworth. His opinions, however, were so spread, that a writer of those times tells us "that if you met two persons upon the road, you might be sure that one of them was a *follower of Wickliff*."

The last affair in which Wickliff took any part was relative to a contest between two popes, who both claimed to the chair at Rome. One of them had delegated England to vindicate his claim, in which

ner, bishop of Norwich, took a very active part. Roused by the idea of a war, in which the name of religion was prostituted, Wickliff, even in the decline of life, thought fit to enter his protest against it. Among many spirited observations, he exclaims, When will the proud priest of Rome grant indulgences to mankind to live in peace and charity, as he now does to fight and slay one another? For this opposition it is thought that Wickliff might have been involved in new troubles, but, being struck with the palsy, he soon after died quietly at Lutterworth, in the year 1384. In the counsel of Constance, 1415, the opinions of Wickliff were condemned, and his bones were dug up and burnt.

With an allusion to the subsequent extension of his doctrines, Rapin happily remarks, "His ashes were thrown into the brook which runs through Lutterworth; the brook conveyed them to the Severn, and the Severn to the sea!" This mean and impotent triumph over dust and ashes was thus rendered indicative of the diffusion of rational Christianity.

From this brief narrative, it appears that, to attack long established opinions, however erroneous, is attended with danger; that every attempt at reformation will incur the enmity of those who are interested in the perpetuity of the abuses: that the most effectual way of correcting what is wrong, either in doctrine or discipline, is by making an appeal to the scriptures: and finally, that *the truth*, however oppressed by human additions, will, at length, shake off these adventitious incumbrances, and shine forth in its native purity. Few opinions were more traduced than those of Wickliff; yet over his enemies he has triumphed, and will continue to triumph more completely in the eye of future generations!

The writer of the topography of Leicestershire informs us that the pulpit of Wickliff is still standing at Lutterworth—that very pulpit whence he declaimed with energy against the obstinate errors and outrageous profligacy of the Church of Rome. Here, like

Noah; this modern *preacher of righteousness* stood for a time, singly and alone—his cause was the cause of God and truth—his efforts to enlighten and reform were essential to the best interests of mankind.

To use the expressions of a late biographer, with the single addition in the parenthesis, "JOHN WICKLIFF, for his superior penetration, the justness of his sentiments, and the undaunted spirit with which he engaged in the great cause of *religious liberty*, was a real honor to his country. Wickliff appears to have been a man of exemplary and unblemished morals; and, notwithstanding the number and vigilance of his enemies, they have none of them presumed to tax him with any immoralities. But tho in his private character he appears to have been very respectable, yet it is his *public character* which principally entitles him to our attention and regard. In an age of ignorance and superstition, he let in such a *radiance of light*, that all the arts of the Romish Church, and all the terrors of persecution, (the sure resource of a false cause) could never afterwards totally obscure it. And the propagation of his opinions had certainly the happiest effect in promoting that REFORMATION, which afterwards delivered the kingdom from ignorance, superstition and ecclesiastical tyranny! By every true Protestant, therefore, the memory of Wickliff will ever be held in the highest honor. And the example of those illustrious men, who have nobly and fearlessly labored in the cause of *truth* and *liberty*, ought to animate us to exert ourselves to prevent attempts which may be made by the zealous and defatigable adherents of popery, to involve us more in the darkness and bondage of Roman superstition."

The same excellent biographer adds, "The works of Wickliff were very numerous, yet he seems not to have been engaged in any large work. His pieces in general, might be properly called tracts, and the greatest part of them on different subjects in divinity, tho some of them were on school questions."

and others on subjects of more general knowledge. Some of them were written in Latin, and others in English. But as Wickliff lived before the invention of printing, there are but few of his pieces which have been printed."

REMARKS ON THE SENTIMENTS OF HOPKINSIANS.

The attentive reader will recollect that in our last, we published the sentiments of Hopkinsians. Some of the leading features of these sentiments we now propose to take into consideration; to compare them with scripture, and with each other.

In the first article of the Hopkinsian creed, we find, "that all true virtue, or real holiness, consists in *disinterested benevolence*." This benevolence is explained, as embracing "*universal being*, including God and all intelligent creatures. It wishes and seeks the good of *every individual* so far as is consistent with the greatest good of the whole." But the greatest good of the whole on their plan, does by no means embrace the happiness of *each* individual, among God's intellectual creatures. For in common with the Calvinists, they hold that some men God "was pleased to pass by, and ORDAIN to dishonor and wrath, to the praise of his vindictive justice." Therefore, the greatest good of the whole is understood in a collective sense, and in such a way as to have no particular regard to *individual* happiness. This we find further exemplified by the next article that treats of the opposite of benevolence. It is there said, "that all sin consists in selfishness. By this is meant an *interested* selfish affection, by which a person sets himself up as supreme, and the only object of regard; and nothing is good or lovely in his view, unless suited to promote his own private interest."

We will now suppose it was possible for a man to divest himself of the feelings of individual interest, (which we confess would be a situation we never experienced,) and then attempt to determine how such

a man could regulate his moral conduct. Let him possess such an ardor to promote the *general good*, as to have no regard to his own destiny, but "approve in his heart of the divine conduct, tho God should cast him off for ever." Now in this situation, let him try to fulfil the great commandment of the law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Being divested of all individual interest and love of self, what ground is there left him, whereby he can feel an interest and love for his neighbor?

The man that knows no individual love of self, cannot possibly know how to love his neighbor as himself. It will follow then of undeniably consequence, that one of the great commandments of God's law, is made void by this doctrine of disinterested benevolence.

Now let us suppose the man perceives in his neighbor, the tokens of reprobation, as he has no regard to individual happiness, would he not now begin to rejoice in the hopeful prospect of his neighbor's extreme misery, as his disinterested soul expects it will produce so much good in the intelligent universe. In such a situation how can he *wish* to have his neighbor saved? But if he does not wish to have him saved, how is he conformed to the will of God "who will have all to be saved?"

Again, let this man try the Savior's golden rule. How can he do by others, as he would wish them to do by him, when he has no interest in his own particular happiness? When he has no concern whether he is damned or saved; but all his concern is for the glory of God?

The Hopkinsian doctrine, which is generally considered a refinement of the Calvinistic, appears peculiarly calculated to lead a man into difficulty. For when he has travelled in it to the utmost of his power, he is but miserably situated in his relation to his fellow man. He has but a very limited opportunity for the proper exercise of rational and social feelings.

In the fourth article of the Hopkinsian system, we are told "that the impotency of sinners with respect

to believing in Christ, is not natural but moral ; for it is a plain dictate of common sense that natural impossibility excludes all blame ;” How this idea is reconcileable with their views of “the divine decrees” for which they warmly contend, is utterly beyond our comprehension. If the volitions of the mind are bound by the eternal laws of fate, and are necessarily moved to every thought, in what sense can there be any more *moral* freedom than *natural* ? That they believe some sinners possess this moral inability, is evident from their being *ordained* to wrath to the praise of God’s vindictive justice. God would surely see that the beings which he ordained to wrath, should never accept of his salvation. Where then is their moral liberty to come to him ? The Hopkinsian very rationally says, “that natural impossibility excludes all blame.” Why ? Because the man is not *able* to perform what is required of him. Now let us look at moral inability. What is its weakness ? *Total depravity*. Nothing can act out of its proper sphere ; of course, we know not how the mind that is totally depraved is *able* to obey a good requisition. We see no difference then, on the Hopkinsian ground, between natural and moral inability. Both are alike controlled by the irresistible laws of absolute necessity. But it is needful for them to use some plausible pretext to support this difference, or the absurdity of their doctrine would appear too glaring to be well received by their own admirers.

In the seventh article we are told, “that the introduction of sin is upon the whole for the general good,” notwithstanding God has an “infinite aversion to sin, and all his inherent perfections.” That God should have an infinite aversion to that which is “for the greatest good,” is another subject that belongs to the metaphysics of Hopkinsians, and not to us, to explain. Perhaps the reader would wish to know our opinion, why God ever introduced sin into our system, if not for some benevolent purpose. Answer, we deny the position that God ever introduced sin into our world.

Each sinner introduced his own sins himself. That it was fit that man should be made with moral powers, we have no reason to doubt, since we are fully persuaded that such is the case. Sin comes by means of an abuse of those faculties and powers that God has given us for good. Because we have misused the powers that God has given us, and contrary to the divine commandment, shall we attribute that misuse to God? We do not believe there is any good in sin, in the abstract, nor that any good will ever come out of it. There may be works connected with it, or suggested by it, through the ignorance of the sinner, that may be good; but they are good, not because they conform to the object of the sinner, but because they are opposite to his design. If God overrules sin for good now, why not overrule it for good to all eternity, and thus suffer it ever to exist. Overruling the works connected with it or suggested by it, for good, and overruling sin for good, are different things; and tho we assent to the former, we are disposed to deny any propriety in the latter.

The ninth and tenth articles of the Hopkinsians, faith concerning the *transferring* of sin and the imputation of righteousness, are so near our views that we are not disposed to make them the subject of animadversion. Neither was it our design to enter into a full investigation of the topics which we have had under consideration. We give the reader these few remarks, that he may have some outlines of the difference between our sentiments and those of Hopkinsians.

From the Christian Spectator.

ON UNIVERSAL SALVATION.

There are two classes of Universalists, one who maintain that there are punishments in the future world, but not eternal; and the other, that there are no punishments at all. Now, tho there is at first sight a considerable difference between these doctrines; yet, on a nearer inspection they appear to be

much of the same character. Both are brought forward for the same purpose, to quiet the conscience in the commission of sin; the fear of a limited punishment hereafter has much the same effect as the fear of no punishment at all.

The argument in support of both these schemes is an *a priori* one. The abettors of them assume a knowledge of the operations of God before they come to consider his declarations; and when these declarations are found they must all be squared with ideas previously imbibed. In fact, the men of whom I speak do not attend to the plain assertions of the Bible, but hunt up some passages which are acknowledged to be obscure, (such as 1 Pet. iii. 19,) and build their faith upon them. Now a fair interpretation of the bible, as of any other book, is to explain the obscure passages in such a manner that they may not contradict the plain ones. If a writer declares in the plainest terms and in many ways, a particular truth; it is very unfair to throw aside all these plain declarations and resort to a passage of doubtful import to ascertain what his sentiments are with respect to that truth.

The question with the Universalist may be very much simplified by reducing it to a question of fact, and proceeding on the principles of inductive philosophy. With the Bible in our hands, acknowledged to be a revelation from God, it ill becomes us to sit in judgement on what God must do according to our feeble and short sighted notions of justice. We must take his own account of himself, and rely upon it. Like the philosopher who proceeds on the principles of Bacon and Newton, we must not presume beforehand on what is the character of the divine operations. We must be totally in the dark till we are enlightened from the proper source. We must patiently learn the facts developed before we can form our theory. Why should not this, which is allowed to be the only legitimate method of reasoning in philosophy, be acknowledged also in religion? Can we pretend to know

more about the unsearchable God than we do about some of his works? Can we ascertain from a previous knowledge of his character what will be the conduct he will pursue towards the subjects of the moral government, better than we can the laws which he has set in operation in the natural world?

The question respecting the extent of the atonement has nothing to do with the question before us, for whether the atonement be made for all or only for the elect, it still remains to ascertain whether there are no personal conditions of acceptance with God. A way opened for salvation is one thing, and walking in that way is totally another. The question then is, what is the fact as to individual salvation. And we are to settle this question just as we do every other which has not come under our personal observation, by testimony. And what but the divine testimony is sufficient?

Nor is the question before us whether the eternal damnation of the wicked is consistent with the glory of God, or with the ends of universal benevolence. Of this we are not competent judges. We know nothing about God, except so far as he has told us; and certainly if we profess to take the scriptures for our guide, we should follow them whithersoever they lead us. For aught we know, the eternal damnation of the wicked, taken in connexion with the thousand other events in the divine kingdom from the beginning of the creation to the grand consummation of all things, will be a great display of God's benevolence towards intelligent beings in general. For aught we know, all the inhabitants of this world are a very small part of the creatures of God; and for aught we know, those who shall be cast into the bottomless pit, will be nothing in comparison with the multitudes which no man can number, that shall shout hosannahs before the throne of God. Of these things we are absolutely ignorant, except so far as God has told us. Until then we can look down the long vista of ages through a boundless eternity, and comprehend the vast chain

of causes and effects in the kingdom of God, we have nothing to do with the question whether any particular doctrine is consistent with the divine glory or not, any further than the book of God informs us. The glory of God and the ends of his government are not planned for a day. It is not for thousands of ages, nor for millions, that God's glory is concerned. It is for eternity. It is for the great whole of existence, which God only can comprehend. It is therefore highly unphilosophical and unsafe, as well as unchristian, to undertake to determine what shall be for the glory of God, or for the good of his kingdom, by our own independent knowledge. We are absolutely ignorant on this question, and cannot be informed except from God himself. Our concern is with matter of fact, of which we are competent judges. We can understand, if we please, the plain declarations of God's word; and these are sufficient for our direction. God will vindicate his own character.

Let it not be forgotten then, we come to the question before us, as a question of fact; and we have nothing to do but to take the testimony of God to settle it. "What saith?" the scriptures, is the only inquiry which is consistent on this subject with the legitimate principles of reasoning.

On opening the Bible we find that the same lips which commanded the apostles to preach the gospel to every creature, said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." And lest we should mistake the meaning of this denunciation, the Lord Jesus has given us (Matt. xxv. 31 and onward) a particular account of the judgement day.

I take it for granted that this is the judgement day which is mentioned in this passage, because no other event in the kingdom of God can answer to the description here given. It certainly cannot be the destruction of Jerusalem, as is alleged by some, because all the circumstances mentioned, are totally diverse from that event. There was not, on that occasion, an

assemblage of all nations ; nor were they separated one from another ; nor was there any thing at all analogous to the sending away of one class into "everlasting punishment," (whatever be the meaning of that phrase,) and the receiving of the other into "the eternal." There is, moreover, not even an obscure allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem any nearer the passage in question, than ten or twelve verses before the end of the preceding chapter ; and that ingenuity which can bring together such distant points must be a wonderful talent indeed.

The Lord Jesus Christ informs us then, in the passage now before us, that he himself shall be the Judge when all nations shall be gathered before him, and that "he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats ; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on his left." And then the particular sentence of condemnation or acquittal is distinctly made known. I ask here, *who* shall be separated one from another ? Not surely the devils from the human race, as is alleged by some ; for the devils are not mentioned in this place as having any thing to do with this day. *All nations* shall be gathered, and separated one from another. This is the answer which the passage itself gives ; and this is the only answer that can be given. Would it not be exceedingly unnatural, and contrary to the use of language, for the Savior to say, "before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another," meaning at the same time that the devils should be separated from the human race ? Suppose a man should say, that the inhabitants of a particular town should be gathered into a certain place, and separated one from another. Would he mean by it that other people should be separated from these ? or rather that these should be separated from each other ? Besides one of these classes are doomed to be companions of the devil and his angels. Can any man believe that all this sublime description terminates thus ?—that the devil

and his angels are to be the companions of the devil and his angels—a mere truism, an identical proposition? Can such trifling as this be ascribed to the Lord Jesus Christ?

Let us look now to the conclusion of this subject. "These shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." Here then is the turning point. What is the meaning of this passage? Whatever it be, this is the declaration of a fact concerning the issue of the awful day described.

I do not expect to be met here with the criticism which is so often in the mouth of the ignorant who attempt to advocate the doctrine I am opposing, that the words *everlasting* and *eternal* are of different signification, because most of those who read the Spectator must be aware that the word in the original Greek is precisely the same for both; these English words being considered by our translators as synonymous, and the change being probably made for the sake of euphony. Does then the passage before us mean that one of the states described by it is interminable, while the other will come to an end? If so, why is there no notice given of such a meaning? The very same qualifying word is used for one that is used for the other. They are placed also in exact opposition to each other:—so that if one of them has a termination, the other has too. You have as much right, according to the well known principles of language, to say from this passage that the happiness of the righteous shall come to an end, as that the misery of the wicked shall come to an end. Here then is a declaration of the fact, that God will punish the wicked in an interminable manner. Now, I must be allowed to remind the reader, we have nothing to do with the question whether such a punishment is right or not. It is a mere question of fact that lies before us; and God himself will settle the right of it at another day.

Again—"He that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."—John iii. 36. Is such an absolute assertion as this to

be construed as meaning, that he shall not see life till a great number of ages of suffering shall have expired his sins? And are we to be told here that the wrath of God does not *abide* on unbelievers, but that some time will come when it shall be taken away? Suppose this text had said, He that believeth not the Lord shall not see death; but the approbation of God shall rest on him; would any one then attempt to say that it meant the contrary? No, reader, the whole race of unbelievers would take their stand on it, and plead with some shew of correctness a reprieve from the condemning passages of the Bible.

It is said of the wicked in the future state of existence, "that their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched." This is admitted to be figurative language, yet it cannot mean less than extreme suffering. Nothing could more effectually describe the endless torment of an accusing conscience than this.

Suppose then for a moment, that the whole philosophy of language, with respect to the use of the word *enduring*, in the Bible, were abandoned. Suppose it were conceded that because it means a limited duration when applied to the hills, the Levitical priesthood, and other subjects which in their very nature are perishable, that therefore it means the same when applied to the human soul, and other subjects which are not perishable: what then shall be done with the great variety of forms in which the misery of the wicked is declared to be without end? An opponent would gain nothing even from this large concession, which would make war with the principles of language. He would still be met with declarations like those I have adduced above, where an endless state is affirmed without the use of this word. So that the doctrine of endless punishment would still stand on the firm foundation of plain declarations of God, as matter of fact.

It avails nothing here to say, as is often said by the advocates of the doctrine I am opposing, when hard pushed by scriptural argument, that this is unreasonable, unjust, tyrannical, too much to bear. These are

not the subjects in debate. I am only inquiring for matter of fact; and whether we see the reasonableness of this fact now or not, God will shew us at last that he is right, and the world wrong. God will promote before an assembled universe at the judgement day, his hatred of sin, and his determination to punish it, and mankind will see that he is right in so doing, and that his glory and the good of his vast dominions will be promoted by such a procedure.

Now these few plain declarations of the word of God are as decisive on the question before us, as a thousand. It is sufficient that the fact stands here. Innumerable other passages indeed might be adduced; and it might be shown that the whole tenor of the sacred scripture is, "Say ye to the righteous, it shall be well with him—wo to the wicked, it shall be ill with him."

It might be shown also that persons very similar to those who advocate the doctrine I am opposing, were opposed by the prophet Jeremiah, (xxiii. 17.) "They say still unto them that despise me, 'The Lord hath said, ye shall have peace; and they say unto every one that walketh after the imagination of his own heart, no evil shall come upon you.'" But I have proceeded as far as I intended. The question is not fairly met by those who would deny the matter of fact here proved, without showing that these passages and others similar to them, mean something very different from what they appear to mean. It is to no purpose to resort to obscure passages to illustrate these plain ones. It is to no purpose to resort to inference in cases where the sacred writers speak of the future state of existence without guarding on every hand against an abuse of their language. It is to no purpose to infer from their silence in particular cases, doctrines contrary to their express declarations here. Nothing can disprove the matter of fact thus plainly declared, but an invalidating of the testimony itself. And this must be done either by proving the Bible a mere imposition upon the world, or by showing that these passages are not genuine, or that they do not mean what they say.

B. G.

REMARKS.

The preceding piece "on universal salvation," from the "Christian Spectator," we have inserted as found in the Evangelical Monitor, printed at Woodstock. It appears to be a very serious tho artful attack on the above named sentiment; and as we are altogether indebted to the Editor of the Monitor for a knowledge of the piece, it is hoped he will not account unfair or ungenerous, that we offer our views of the arguments by which we find ourselves opposed. The reader will notice that our opponent undertakes to refute us by bringing declarations of scripture, expressive to the point, which he calls *matter of fact*. And so confident is he of success that he says, "Nothing can disprove the matter of fact thus plainly declared, but an invalidating of the testimony itself. And this must be done, either by proving the Bible a mere imposition upon the world, or by showing that these passages are not genuine, or that they do not mean what they say."

Now let us look at the declarations which this writer considers matter of fact. One of these is the "*everlasting* punishment," which is mentioned in Matt. xxv. 46. Do the believers in endless misery contend that the word *everlasting* uniformly means an endless duration in scripture? They do not. Even this writer himself allows the limited meaning when "applied to the hills, the Levitical priesthood, and other subjects which in their very nature are perishable." It then follows of course that what he calls *matter of fact* is an ambiguous expression. He cannot but see that it devolves on him, or some one else, to maintain that punishment in its *very nature*, is endless, before the word *everlasting* can unequivocally have that meaning when applied to punishment. As it appears that *most* of the readers of the Spectator can read Greek, (which we conclude is not so generally the case with common periodical works,) and know that the original translated *everlasting* is the same that is translated *eternal* in the passage under consideration,

They may likewise know that the same Greek word is sometimes translated by a word of a limited signification, even in the New Testament. Such instances are found in Rom. xvi. 25, 2 Tim. i. 9, and Titus i. 2, in all of which the Greek is used in the plural number, and rendered *world*. If the believers in endless misery have an unequivocal word to support their doctrine, then let it be uniformly translated by some such word in English; and instead of reading as in Timothy and Titus, *before the world began*, read *before everlasting times*; and in Romans, instead of the *since the world began*, read *since everlasting times*. These latter phrases are literal translations of the Greek text, which in the above phrases, no more conforms to the English in meaning, than in the propriety of idiom. Thus we see that what our writer considers a matter of fact, proves, at the most, a matter of doubt. Should it then be said it is a matter of doubt whether *eternal life* is endless, we answer if we have no other authority than barely the word *eternal*, we grant it is. But *life* and *punishment* are different subjects, and it does by no means follow because life is endless, that punishment likewise is endless. Altho we find them placed in opposition in one verse, there is no qualifying word which represents the duration of the one to be equal to that of the other. But to prove the doctrine of universal salvation, we can produce passages which are coupled together by the words *so* and *even so*. For an example, see Rom. v. 18, 19. "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgement came upon *all* men to condemnation; *even so* by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon *all men* unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience *many* were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall *many* be made righteous." Here the opposites are coupled together in such a manner, that the latter are defined by the former.

In Rom. xvi. 25, 26, and in Titus i. 2, we find the same Greek word, *αιωνιος*, used twice, one translated *eternal* and the other *world*, in each of the above

named passages. Here are two instances in the New Testament, in which this word is acknowledged to have different meanings when applied to different subjects in the same passages. If this is certainly the case in two places, it may be in a third, namely, Matt. xxv. 46. If then the text in Romans before quoted be admitted as a *matter of fact*, it follows that *everlasting* when applied to punishment must be limited. With reference to this passage in Romans let us adopt the language of our opponent, on the same in Matthew. "The question is not fairly met by those who would deny the *matter of fact* here proved, without showing that these passages, and others similar to them, mean something very different from what they appear to mean. It is to no purpose to resort to obscure passages to illustrate these plain ones."

The reader who wishes for a more particular illustration of the word *everlasting*, may consult the first volume of the Christian Repository, page 143, Winchester's Dialogues, and Foster's Examination of Dr. Strong on *universal benevolence reconcilable with endless misery*.

Whether the *everlasting punishment* mentioned in Matthew refers to a future day of judgement, or to events in this life, we think we need not make a subject of investigation at this time, as it cannot on either consideration, very materially effect the subject of dispute concerning the perpetuity of punishment.

We should hardly suppose that men acquainted with scripture phraseology, would think of urging the passage in John iii. 36, to prove endless misery. Speaking of the unbeliever, it says, "the wrath of God abideth on him." When? Now in the present tense. How long shall this wrath abide him? Nothing said. Should any unbeliever be converted, what then? "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life. St. Paul says, "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God?" But is this an assertion that they cannot be saved? Certainly not; for he immediately tells us, "And such were some of

you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God." 1 Cor. vi. 9—11.

Our author observes, "it is said of the wicked in the future state of existence, that "their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched." "Tho," continues this writer, "this is admitted to be figurative language, yet it cannot mean less than extreme suffering." If this be a *matter of fact* in favor of endless misery, we ask, why the same expressions are used with an evident limited signification in scripture. An instance of this kind we have in Isaiah lxvi. 24, "And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." We do not look for the fulfilment of this in eternity, but when "it shall come to pass that from *one new moon to another*, and from *one Sabbath to another*," all flesh shall come to worship before the Lord. Mention is made of fires in scripture which are said *never to be quenched*, that notwithstanding have long since ceased to burn. To this point we refer the reader to Jer. vi. 20; xvii. 27; and Ezek. xx. 47, 48.

As we think the writer has failed in maintaining his "particular account of the judgement day," it will not follow of necessary consequence, because "he that believeth not shall be damned," that he will be *endlessly* damned. We may avoid a mistake, and yet believe this damnation is much short of endless misery.

We cannot but admire the care which this writer has exercised to maintain the doctrine of endless misery. The question "whether the eternal damnation of the wicked is consistent with the *glory* of God, or with the ends of universal benevolence," he is not disposed to allow us to call up. For "of this," he says, "we are not competent judges." "I am inquiring," he further says, "for matter of fact; whether we see the reasonableness of this fact now or not, God

will show us at last that he is right, and the we wrong." So for the *great glory* of God in the endless suffering of the wicked, we must be kept in suspense, to some unknown period of futurity, with the privilege of attending to a single argument of this enlightened brother of human nature. But it turns out, this subject of the *divine glory* was decided in the following manner nearly eighteen hundred years ago. "If the ministration of death written and engraven in stones was *glorious*, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance, which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather *glorious*. For if the ministration of condemnation be *glory*, MUCH MORE doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in *glory*." 2 Cor. 3, 7, 8. As we here learn that there is a greater *glory* than that of condemnation, we are confident that endless misery is not consistent with that greater and divine glory of God. And we are very glad to see this matter so fully decided to our satisfaction, notwithstanding the disposition of our opponent to keep us in perpetual suspense.

Respecting the two classes of Universalists, we wish to have no contention with a believer in endless misery. That "both" systems "are brought forward for the same purpose, to quiet the conscience in the commission of sin," looks like *judging before the time*. We think our opponents ought to allow that we are as well acquainted with our "purposes" as they are, and that they ought not to publish that such was our *purpose*, until we had told them. As for the opinion that "the fear of a limited punishment hereafter has much the same effect as the fear of no punishment at all," we think not very strange. People that are in a habit of dealing much in *infinities*, generally suppose *limited things* something like *nothing* at all. But when their system is out of sight, they are as fearful of having a limb *burnt* or *bruised* as any of us, altho it should be healed in a few months. We

who believe in the doctrine of a future limited punishment, believe that the fear of it is some different from the fear of no punishment at all. We are likewise willing to acknowledge it is different from the fear of endless misery. While the former imposes a rational restraint, the latter fills the mind with horror and dismay.

P. S. After writing the foregoing remarks, we found this piece, "on universal salvation," inserted and answered in the Universalist Magazine of Boston. It likewise appears from the Christian Intelligencer of Portland, in which we also find an answer, that the Editor of the Christian Mirror had not only copied it into his paper from the Spectator, but had printed and distributed it in *hundreds* if not in *thousands* of handbills, and gratuitously sent them abroad, as the last, best, and most potent argument of orthodoxy, against the assertion that "God is the Savior of all men." So it appears it is going the round, and in its course has not overlooked Vermont. Had we supposed the piece so alarming to Universalists as our opposers seem to insinuate by their exertions to give it publicity, we might perhaps have spent more time and labor in answering it. But as topics of a similar nature have been so frequently discussed in our periodical and other works, we do not consider our doctrine in jeopardy, tho we accompany it with but few remarks.



DISSERTATIONS ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT. NO. 3.

In this number, we propose to notice some passages of scripture that appear to have an evident allusion to a period of suffering or punishment beyond this life. On this head we may, no doubt, safely premise, that future punishment, in a greater or less degree, is clearly implied in the doctrine of a future judgement. If the latter, then, be established, the former will follow of course. But we are under no necessity of taking this for granted. We are able to bring scripture proofs, that when the period of judgement is,

then is the period of punishment. Indeed, the very idea of judgement implies some degree of suffering, exposure to, or danger of suffering. Bringing men to judgement, brings them to *trial*,—not that the all-knowing God might learn what the characters of the creatures are, or how he will dispose of them, but that he may show men their characters, and the wisdom of his providence.

On the subject of punishment connected with judgement, we cite from 2 Pet. ii. 9. "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgement to be punished." This text is express to the point. The idea, also, that the ungodly are punished to the full extent of their wickedness, in their acts, is clearly opposed: this doctrine admits of no reserve to a future day to be punished. It is, likewise, clear from this passage, that the day of judgement must mean some particular future period, designated by the phrase, and not any time whatever, or there could be no reserving any one to that day. We do not say the passage is equally definite in referring to a period of future life; but the nature of the subject, and its relative connection with other passages of a similar description, naturally require it.

Passages of this description, connecting punishment or suffering with judgement, are the following: Jude 6. "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgement of the great day." 2 Pet. ii. 4. "If God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgement." We need not stop here to dispute with any man, whether the angels here mentioned are human or spiritual beings. Soberly it to say, they are such beings as sinned, and such as did not receive their punishment in sinning; but were reserved unto judgement or condemnation.

Nor need we attend to the inquiry whether these

sentences were quoted from the Jewish traditions, and whether they are to be received on the authority of inspiration concerning the fall of angels. Unless, in such case, they bear a proper analogy to the doctrine of punishment, they surely would be unworthy the place which they occupy.

Having thus shown from scripture, that the day of judgement is a period of punishment for such as are then ungodly, we may now make it a subject of inquiry, whether we may expect such a judgement in a future state, or in a state beyond the present. We have already offered some reasons in favor of such a conclusion, in the course of these dissertations; but now propose to be more particular on this head. The words of St. Paul in Acts xxiv. 25, appear to contain some evidence of what we now labor to maintain. "And as," says the historian, "he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgement to come, Felix trembled." Now in order to come at a probable cause of Felix's trembling, let us look at what we may suppose might be the state of his mind, from the influence of the religious sentiments of his age. Among the Jews, the Pharisees and Essenes were believers in future rewards and punishments. Of the former, it is said, "They believed in the immortality of the soul, and the resurrection, and the future reward of the righteous, whom they reckoned to be only the Jews; and that tho the souls of the wicked went directly to hell at their death, yet their bodies never rose again." Of the latter the same writer observes, "They believed the immortality of the soul, and the existence of angels, and a state of future rewards and punishments."—*Wood's Bible Dictionary*. Among the sentiments of the philosophers of that age, Dr. Moshiem says, "Plato is generally looked upon as superior to all the other philosophers in wisdom; and this eminent rank does not seem to have been undeservedly conferred upon him. He taught that the universe was governed by a being, glorious in power and wisdom, and possessed of a perfect liberty and

independence. He extended also the views of mortals beyond the grave, and showed them, in *futurity*, *prospects adapted to excite their hopes, and work upon their fears.*"

Tho we should allow that Felix was not a particular adherent of any of these sects, still their doctrines might have had an imperceptible influence upon his mind, which on the occasion of St. Paul's preaching, and enforcing the idea of a judgement to come, ~~would~~ arouse to open sensibility the latent feelings of *fear*. The Apostle's reasoning of righteousness and temperance, in connexion with a judgement to come, set home to Felix's mind a strong conviction for his iniquity, and powerfully portrayed to his view the unhappy and lasting consequences of a wicked life. Is it not reasonable to conclude that the cause of Felix's trembling was his hearing the doctrine of righteousness and temperance more clearly explained, and the practice more powerfully enforced, and, in addition to this, a future judgement and consequent punishment for wickedness, more certain and more terrible, ~~than~~ he was accustomed to hear? Can it be rationally accounted for any other consideration? On the other hand, had St. Paul reasoned on these subjects as many of our preachers now do, would Felix, or any other man like him, be likely to tremble? Has the reasoning of the best orators we have on these subjects ever been known to produce such effects? I speak with reference to those that deny all future punishments; and, no doubt we may say, without being charged with pedantry or ostentation, that we have men of this class, of very renowned talents in the art of *reasoning*. Had Felix totally disbelieved the doctrine of future punishment, and St. Paul had argued against it, what could have made him tremble? Had Felix disbelieved the doctrine, and St. Paul had reasoned contrary according to his views, his attention would have been called to less punishment than he believed, of course no one could suppose that in that case he would have trembled. Hence it is perceived that

the text cannot but have a strong bearing in favor of future punishment from this consideration.

Another scripture in proof of the point for which we labor, is found in Acts xvii. 30, 31. "And the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where to repent: because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." This passage will justify the following remarks:

1. If the punishment of sin is always immediately and inseparably connected with the act, we know not how God winked at "the times of ignorance," any more than under that dispensation in which the light of the gospel shone.

2. God's appointing a day to judge the world denotes some particular period. Did it denote *any* time whatever, it would not be an *appointed* day.

3. It being an appointed day to judge the world, the judgement must of course naturally follow the works of the world, for which it is judged.

4. God's calling all men every where to repent, is enforced from the consideration that *all* men are to be judged, in the day which God has appointed.

5. If the day which God has appointed, denotes some specified period, and not *any* time, and was in the apostolic age, then the text does not call on those of after ages to repent, from the consideration that there will be a judgement, because the judgement is past already.

6. But if the judgement is some particular period; and all the world are to be judged, it will follow that this *day* of judgement is in future life.

The words of St. Paul, in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, chapter v. verses 8, 9, 10, very justly deserve notice in this place. "We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labor; that whether present or absent, we may be accepted

of him. For we must all appear before the judgement seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." We notice in this passage, that St. Paul speaks of "appearing before the judgement-seat of Christ," as an event then future;—"we must"—not, we *do*. Then to account this appearing before the judgement-seat of Christ, the gospel dispensation agrees not with the phraseology of the passage. The phrase "*we all*" comprehends too much universality, to be accommodated to the believers of that or any one particular age. This is fully confirmed by Rom. xiv. 10, 11, "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgement-seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, *every* knee shall bow to me, and *every* tongue shall confess to God." It is further plain by every one's receiving the things done in his body, or receiving the judgement of things done in his body, that the appearing before the judgement-seat of Christ, will be after the works of the body are finished. The Apostle says, we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him. There is such a thing as being accepted of him, when absent from the body, as well as when present in the body. There may likewise be such a thing as not to be accepted when absent from the body; or it would be useless *labor* for that acceptance as the Apostle said they did.

In connexion with the passage last cited, let the Apostle's question to him who judges rashly be noticed. "And thinkest thou, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgement of God?" Should you tell the mistaken man that calculates to escape, that the reason why he cannot escape, is because God's judgements and chastisements are always immediately connected with the crimes of the wicked in correcting his mistake, how much would you also

the question ? He thought he *should* escape ; you tell him he *does* not escape. He says, I know what I experience in the present tense ; you tell him, he need not expect God will call him to judgement after this life. Every reader may calculate how forcible the Apostle Paul's question would be, according to these views. We have reason therefore, to believe, these views are not justified by the natural import of his language, in many passages which are contained in his writings.

It seems hardly necessary, after a careful attention to the passages already cited on the subject of future judgement and punishment, to add to their number ; but to show that the scriptures are far from being barren on this subject, we will subjoin one from Matt. xi. 23, 24. "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell ; for if the mighty works which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom *in the day of judgement*, than for thee."

In the passage before us, we find a comparison of Capernaum with Sodom. Both are arraigned in the day of judgement ; and the judgement of Sodom is as much represented to be future to the time in which Christ spake, as Capernaum. The words, "shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgement than for thee," put their judgement both alike in the future tense by the phrase *shall be*. If this point be fairly decided, as it seems it is, let us next inquire ; Where were the inhabitants of Sodom when our Savior uttered these words ? Not in the land of the living. Long ere then, they had been numbered with those nations and great men of the earth, a remembrance of whom is preserved only in the annals of history. Then the judgement of Sodom, to which our Savior alluded, could not be in this life ; and as Capernaum is to have a judgement less tolerable, at a particular time, called *the day of judgement*,

hers must be in the future state also. And if these receive judgement in the future state at the day of judgement, it proves the day of judgement to be after this life.

"Should it be said the judgement of Sodom to which our Savior referred, was her destruction by fire, as it was said, she was set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire, it may be answered, then the language of our Savior was calculated to deceive. Had he said, 'It was more tolerable for the land of Sodom in her day of judgement, than shall be for you in yours,' the idea would have been clearly expressed, by putting the judgement of Sodom in the past time, and Capernaum in the future. But he who spake with authority and not as the scribes, expressed it differently,

"Our subject, likewise, admits no evasion by understanding Sodom figuratively. The text is clear in expression that old Sodom was meant. This is evident from these words; "If the mighty works which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day."

"As Capernaum, in our text is compared with Sodom, so in other places, Chorazin and Bethsaida are compared with Tyre and Sidon. Of Tyre and Sidon, our Savior said, as he did of Sodom, it shall be more tolerable in the day of judgement than for Chorazin and Bethsaida. And it is as evident that by Tyre and Sidon is meant those ancient cities; known by those names, as it is that by Sodom is intended the city so memorable for being suddenly destroyed by fire."

The above remarks on the passage under consideration, were published by the Editor about four years ago, since which time, we have had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with some of the methods made use of by the deniers of future punishment to avoid their force. These, it may be proper briefly to notice, as they have at different times made their appearance in public. One of them, which we consider as more evasion, is, that the inhabitants of old Sodom were not

meant, but the literal *land* or *soil* that suffers more tolerably in the day of judgement. Such consider the judgement of Sodom to be the time of her destruction by fire. But it is well known that the inhabitants were destroyed by that fire, as well as the land, which, according to that interpretation, were not included in our Lord's meaning. Can any reasonable person suppose that Christ meant to compare the judgement of Capernaum, which he said was exalted to heaven, with the *literal soil* of old Sodom? We surely should not have thought it, had we not known that it has been adopted. Land is frequently used by a figure of speech for the inhabitants that live upon it, as house is used for the people who dwell in it. God says by the prophet Malachi, (chap. iii. 12) to Israel, "And all nations shall call *you* blessed; for *ye* shall be a delightful *land*." What will be a delightful *land*? "*Ye*," the people. See further on this subject in the Christian Repository, Volume 3d, pages 65 and 82. We find this judgement of Sodom is noticed in Luke x. 12, where the word *land* is not used. But after all, if it must be the literal land of Sodom that was meant, let some one show us what literal land ever suffered less tolerably than the land of Sodom. It has ever been represented by historians a barren waste from the time of its destruction to the present.

Another method of accommodating this passage to the ancient destruction of the Sodomites is by asserting that the future, *shall be*, is a Hebraism for the past tense, *hath been*. But if this is the case, the judgement of Capernaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida, past when it was threatened! But if theirs were future, why not Sodom, Tyre and Sidon, expressed by the same phrase in the same place that expresses the other? That the phrase, *shall be*, should mean at the same time, both the future and the past, is neither an Hebraism, Grecism, nor Anglicism, according to any lexicon, dictionary, or grammar that ever we saw (and we have seen not a few,) but it is an *ism* that never had a name, and we think never ought to have.

We forbear to attempt an illustration of ~~more~~ passages in this place, in relation to this subject; but submit the passages already quoted, with the remarks and arguments accompanying them, to the candor and impartiality of our friends.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR ON THE FAITH OF THE ANCIENT FATHERS.

Dear and respected Brother,

As it is not generally known that any of the ancient Fathers were believers in the final salvation of all men, I think it may be subserving a useful purpose to publish, in the *Christian Repository*, the following statements.

I was led to this train of thinking, by reading a book entitled, *Universal Damnation and Universal Salvation* clearly proved by the scriptures. The author of the work was an Episcopalian. In pages 110, 111, we find the following; "For what can condemn any man if the sins of all are satisfied for? If they are not saved it is plain they cannot be punished; but there is no middle way between salvation and damnation, so that you must see the Church of England has, in her articles, taught the salvation of all men, at least, implicitly; and am I to be condemned for differing from all the Church clergy in doctrine, because I preach the doctrine contained in the 39th article? Is this a crime: to preach the doctrine, contained in the articles of the church of England, because it is said, none of the rest of the clergy teach so, but the contrary? Will the preaching of the doctrine of the Church of England contradict the doctrine of her clergy? Can preaching the doctrine of the Church of England, be shewing disrespect to her Bishops, or great writers or clergy who composed the 39 articles? But my teaching that all mankind will finally be happy, is not preaching contrary to what is and ever has been taught by the rest of the clergy of the Church of England. Nor no less a man than the Archbishop

Tillotson, has been written against, for preaching this doctrine; and at least in one of his sermons, he did intimate that this was his opinion, tho at the same time he appeared to be in darkness and doubt about it; and several others of the clergy of the Church have taught the salvation of ALL MEN.

Mr. Mardon, a Church clergyman, has for several years preached the same doctrine, and has printed a book on the subject, and yet is in full and regular standing under his bishop. Dr. Steed, who was of our order, and was greatly admired in most parts of England, in a sermon he delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral Church in London, has these words; "Our Savior laid down his life for the sins of the whole world; he came, that as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." Again, speaking of Christ, says he, "The sphere of his beneficence extended backwards to the foundation of the world, and reaches forward to the last conflagration, he became the Savior of all ages: from the first birth of time to its last period. The Father of mankind, from the rising of the sun, to the going down of the same. The blessings of his coming into the world are as extensive as the world, and as lasting as eternity."

He continues, "Behold the Son of God, pouring forth his blood, as well as prayers, even for those that shed it; behold him, at once, bearing the insults, expiating the sins, and procuring happiness for mankind, till at last he bows his sacred head, and shuts up the solemn scene, with these short but comprehensive words, *it is finished*:—the great, the stupendous work. The universal sacrifice, which shall take in all mankind, and which all mankind shall contemplate throughout eternity with awful joy and gratitude, is completed: Our Savior was a person born for the whole world, for which he died, a blessing to all mankind, from the beginning of time, and whom all mankind will have reason to bless, when time shall be no more."

From the Apostles' time, till the introduction of

Popery, is a period of about four or five hundred years; in which time, the general opinion of bishops and clergy of the Christian church was, that all mankind would be finally and everlastingly happy, if we believe Dr. Whitby, who was esteemed a great and learned divine of the Church of England. Says Dr. Whitby, "This hath been the constant doctrine of the Church of Christ, owned by the Greek and Latin fathers;—among the Greek fathers, Chrysostom, whose words are these, When the fulness of the Gentiles is come in, then all Israel shall be saved, at the time of Christ's second coming, and the consummation of all things." Says Origen, "They of the people of Israel, who for their unbelief were deserted, that God's mercy might be showed to you, they shall not always be left in unbelief; but when the dispensation of the fulness of the Gentiles is completed, they also shall find mercy; Israel may then also enter; for if the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, then all Israel shall be saved, and then there shall be one fold and one Shepherd."

All the Latin fathers, who have left us any commentaries or notes on the Epistle to the Romans, did plainly believe in the salvation of all men:—Of this you will be convinced by reading Hilary the Deacon, Primasius, Sedurius, and Homo. St. Augustin says, that the carnal Israelite, who now will not believe, shall hereafter do so. St. Cyril was also of the same mind.—St. Jerome, having cited those words of Christ, spoken to the barren fig-tree, Let no fruit grow on thee forever, Matt. xxi. 19, bids us consider, that he saith not forever and ever, but only in seculum, for that age; and when that day is past, and when the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, then this fig-tree shall bear fruit again, and all Israel shall be saved.

We think the enemies of our faith ought not to accuse us, (as they frequently do) of holding to new invented doctrines of men. So far from that, that we have, according to our ideas, indubitable testimony, written by inspiration, that this doctrine was taught

to our first parents, but more certainly to Abraham, as well as to all the holy prophets, since the world began. It is also certain, that the first Christian authors, who wrote the first after the Apostles' day, were believers in the restitution of all mankind. Now is it not more reasonable to suppose, that the first writers would state, correctly, the doctrines taught by our Savior and his Apostles, than those who lived in after periods, when truth was hidden with vain traditions, superstitions, and bigotry? I think all must answer in the affirmative. It is true, some errors crept into the churches in an early day, but none of that magnitude as the one we are considering. And we might be surprised and wonder, that the doctrine of endless misery should so soon be believed by the professed followers of their all glorious and merciful Redeemer, were it not a doctrine that is so highly pleasing to the carnal mind, which is not subject to the law of God, neither in deed can be. The carnal mind must be destroyed, before one can be brought into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

Dear sir, I would not be thought to embrace for my creed the whole of the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England. I would only say, that the doctrine of universal salvation is plainly implied in some of their articles, but is not denied by any, agreeable to the ideas of the writer above quoted. C. C.

From the Universalist Magazine.

NOTICE.—*By request.*

It is with deep regret that I am compelled to contradict a statement, contained in the above extract [*namely, the extract published in our last*] from Rev. Edward Turner's letter to Rev. Samuel C. Loveland. The statement is in the following words: "Mr. Ballou made the first advances to settle." This indicates that, respecting the difficulty between me and Mr. Dean, I considered myself in the wrong, and

made the first advances to settle, and this to help myself out of difficulty; all of which is totally erroneous.—But I wish to guard against any suspicion being entertained of Mr. Turner's veracity, in this case, for he has fully certified that Mr. Dean gave him such information; and I am sorry to say that Mr. Dean has made the same incorrect statement to a number of others.—I would also inform those who have heard this statement, that I have in my possession, all the papers respecting my complaint against Mr. Dean, and our settlement, and will satisfy any who will call on me.

HOSEA BALLOU.

We, the subscribers, take this way to correct another mistake in the above extract of Rev. Mr. Turner's letter. The mistake is found in the following words: "not long since the Junior Editors [of the Magazine] informed the public, that they had no right to make a distinct settlement." This is a mistake.—What we informed the public was, that the Editors had entered into a mutual understanding that we would not *publish any thing relative to the Appeal to the Public*, without the consent of all the Editors. We never stated that we had no right to make a *distinct settlement*.

HOSEA BALLOU, 2d.

THOMAS WHITEMORE.

Thank you, gentlemen, for this correction. Did you not tell us you did sign a *mutual agreement*, and *agree* that that agreement *should be published*, and was not the latter agreement, as well as the former, indispensably necessary to a "distinct settlement" of those difficulties that *had been published*? If you had entered into a mutual understanding not to publish any thing relative to the 'Appeal to the Public,' "without the consent of all the Editors," did not said "mutual understanding" deprive you of the "right" to publish said mutual agreement? If then you had no right to fulfil all that was necessary to "a distinct settlement," tho you might make and sign "a mutual

agreement," it still appears from your own statements, that you say you "never stated" it, that you had "no right" to make "a distinct settlement." How much more, then, does the mistake amount to, than merely a departure from your own phraseology?

EDITOR.

WESTERN ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of this Association, the present year, was held at Otsego, the first Wednesday and Thursday of June last. They had three discourses the first day as follows: Br. J. S. Flagler, from Ex. xx. 7; Br. J. Whitnall, from Isa. lxvi. 18; and Br. P. Morse, from Gen. iii. 24. Two discourses, the second day; Br. Jones, from 1 Pet. iii. 15; and Br. S. R. Smith, from 1 Tim. iv. 16. Brs. Benjamin Hickox and Ezra S. Goodwin received fellowship, as preachers of the everlasting gospel. Br. Amos Reed, Arthur Field, and Henry Roberts, received ordination. The Societies in Little Falls, Salisbury, Onondaga, and Walton, were received into fellowship.

Received requests from a number of societies for the organization of branch associations in the following places, viz. One in Cayuga Co. and its vicinity, to be called the "*Cayuga Association*," and one in Jefferson Co. and its vicinity, to be called "*Black river Association*," and one in Chenango Co. to be called the "*Chenango Association*."

On receiving a request from brother Edwin Ferris, to withdraw from the connexion of the Western Association, not abandoning his faith in universal salvation, nor the duties of the ministry, but on account of minor differences* of opinion, and whereas nothing appeared against the moral and religious deportment of Br. Ferris;—Therefore, resolved, that this Association has no power nor inclination to retain Br. Ferris, contrary to his wish, or the dictates of his own conscience."

*Voted, that this Association be adjourned to meet in Madison, county of Madison, N. Y. the first Wednesday and Thursday in June, 1824."

*These minor differences we understand, were respecting the subject of future punishment.

Obituary.

Died at Ticonderoga, N. Y. July 1, Miss MARIAM MARSH, daughter of Mr. Leonard Marsh of Shoreham, in the 19th year of her age. She was a firm believer in the grace of God that bringeth salvation unto all men.

At Bridgewater, Vt. August 28, Mrs. DEBORAH MENDELL,

wife of Mr. Amos Mendell, aged 57. She was one of the first settlers, and her oldest child was the first born in that town. She had long been a believer in the salvation of all men, and adorned her faith by a well ordered life and conversation.

For the Repository.

THE 137th PSALM PARAPHRASED.

Hard by the banks of Babel's oozy river,
There we sat down to weep and think of Zion;
And there we hang'd our harps untun'd and silent,
High on the willows.

For there the oppressors carried us as captives,
And while they wasted us in cruel bondage,
Ask'd of us mirth, and taunting said unto us,
Sing songs of Zion:

How can we sing the sacred songs of Zion—
Songs of the Lord, and in the land of strangers,
Far from our country under cruel bondage,
Sorely oppressive?

O then, Jerusalem, if I forget thee,
Let this my right hand thus forget her cunning:
If I do not in bondage thee remember,
Be my tongue silent.

And let it cleave unto my mouth's roof speechless,
If I do not Jerusalem distinguish;
And this in honor, should I not prefer it
To my chief pleasure.

D. S*****.

From the Gospel Advocate.

INGRATITUDE.

Among all evils there are none worse than those arising from religious contentions. A few months since, this section of our country was in a state of religious jargon and contention. Presbyterians were arrayed against Methodists; Episcopalians were contending against Calvinists; and Calvinists were anxious to return the compliment. Baptists were against the Arminians, and they against the Baptists! In short, every man's hand was against his neighbor, and to the uninterested beholder, the whole presented a scene of bloodless warfare. But no sooner was the trumpet of the *gospel* of peace on earth, good will to men, sounded in their ears, than the weapons of their warfare were grounded, and one would have been led to suppose their spears were beat into pruning hooks! Alas, O, the ingratitude of the human heart! Forgotten of the cause of their quietness, they no sooner had time to recover their strength, than the tocsin of war was sounded around the standard of "endless wretchedness," and the whole multitude were united, and yet continue to bite the hand that fed them, and rail against those that brought them peace, and imprecate the vilest abuse their friends, the Universalists.!!

OLD HONESTY.

MISCELLANEOUS ARTICLES.

Eastern Association.—This body commenced their annual meeting this year, on the 24th of June, at Waterville, Me. They had three discourses the first day as follows.

1. From Br. Wm. A. Drew, from John xvii. 9.

2. Br. Hosea Ballou, from Gen. xlix. 10.

3. Br. Fayette Mace, from Ps. lxxxiv. 11.

The second day, they had two discourses:

1. Br. Russell Streeter, from Rom. viii. 31.

2. Br. Hosea Ballou, from 2 Cor. iv. 5.

The Universalist Societies of Guilford, Parkman, Sangerville, Acroft, and Dover, were received into fellowship. Brs. At-

kins, and J. W. Hoskins, received letters of fellow-

ship. The preachers who took a part in the public exercises,

besides those already mentioned, were Brs. Wm. Frost, John Woodman, and Sylvanus Cobb. The Association is adjourned to meet at Farmington, Me. on the last Wednesday and Thursday in June, 1824.

It appears by a late report of the society for promoting the education of the poor in Ireland, that the number of their schools is 227, containing 51,637 scholars. The London Hibernian Society patronized 475, in which 53,233 children were instructed. Besides these, there were 90 schools under the Baptist Irish Society, containing 7000 scholars. It is said that the Irish poor eagerly embraced the opportunity of procuring instruction for their children; and that the children evinced great ardor in the acquisition of knowledge. About five sixths of the whole number of children instructed in these schools are Roman Catholics.—*C. Reg.*

In the New York state prison are 580 prisoners. Of these, 195 cannot read, and 52 cannot write. Nearly one fourth of the convicts are blacks, tho the black population of the state is only as 1 to 35.—*ib.*

Rev. Walter Balfour of Charlestown, Mass. a late convert to the faith of universal salvation, has issued proposals for publishing, by subscription, an inquiry into the scriptural import of the words, *sheol*, *hades*, *tartarosas*, and *gehenna*, all translated hell in the common English version. The work is to be printed in one volume octavo, to contain between four and five hundred pages, and to be delivered to subscribers at two dollars in boards.

Baptist Society of the United States.—From a report of the Baptist Convention, held at Washington, it appears there are in the United States, 2,354 churches, and 206,110 members of that denomination.

Plain Truth.

A new College has been recently established in Augusta, Kentucky, under the patronage of the Methodist Episcopal Church.—*S. E. Post.*

We have received a reply, signed a *Friend to the Declaration*, to a couple of articles in the *Universalist Magazine*, signed H. B. on what is known to our readers by the "Declaration." As this Declaration has occasioned considerable excitement among the brethren, and as there has been a public attempt to involve the characters of certain brethren known to be its authors, the Editor has concluded to suffer no attack of this Declaration, under a disguised signature; and if no attack is admitted, no defence is necessary. If H. B. will authorize us to use his name, we will engage him an opponent, who will meet him in the same way.

A duel was lately fought near Grand River, U. C. between Col. Norton, the famous Indian chief, and another chief of his neighborhood, in which the former was slightly, and the latter mortally wounded. The savages are progressing in the arts of civilization.

To Correspondents.—D. S.'s communication was received too late for this number. We are sorry to say we have not room for Br. Briggs' "Notice to the Public," and are obliged to postpone its publication.

CHRISTIAN REPOSITORY.

4

DECEMBER, 1823.

Vol. IV.

SERMON, No. XIII.

Romans ix. 18. *Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will, he hardeneth.*

The doctrines advanced in the Bible are not all of equal, relative importance. Some which we consider of minor consequence, are either deducible from, or embraced in those that are of a more general and comprehensive description. In this case, the general being admitted, the particular points will easily receive our assent. There are other doctrines which require to be treated distinctly; and they appear to derive their importance from the immediate relation they have to the Divine character, and the views in which they present it. We consider a doctrine of the highest consequence, when it gives us sublime, engaging, and rejoicing views of the attributes and character of Deity. We reckon much, and with great respect and propriety, upon the moral influence of such a doctrine, because we feel, that it lies at the very foundation of all religion, piety, and love. On the other hand, if we meet with a sentiment in the Scriptures, that seems to militate with our general and most pleasing views of God, it creates an uneasy sensation, and damps the lively flame that had been enkindled within. And it will be well when such a circumstance does not stagger and unsettle our faith, and lead us too hastily to conclude that the Bible is a mass of contradictions.

Among the doctrines of revelation, that of the sovereignty of God holds a distinguished and conspicuous rank. I know of no one that has been more zealously insisted upon by some, and more confidently denied by others, than this; and these circumstances are sufficient, in some measure, to mark the importance of the doctrine in question. With the views that I entertain

of this subject, I find it not difficult to account for this discordancy of opinion upon this article. One man will seize with avidity upon every literal expression which indicates that God is a Sovereign, because this doctrine is necessary to another which he believes, viz. that the greater part of the family of man are doomed to eternal reprobation; and as this notion cannot be well supported upon known principles of moral equity, it is convenient, and even indispensably necessary to resort to other means; and sovereignty, as it is commonly understood, furnishes these means in abundance. It is a sanctuary, a city of refuge, where the favorite doctrine is shielded from all injury. He that will touch it must come even to the horns of the altar, and expose himself to the charge and the guilt of impiety and profanation. Another person is startled and recoils at this doctrine, probably on account of the use, which the first makes of it, and the doctrine which he brings it to support. Yet, permit me to tell you, that both these men may be in an error; and the truth may lie between their respective theories. The one believes the doctrine in question, because he finds in it an able support to a preconceived opinion, and the other denies it, because he thinks it represents the divine character in a light, at once odious and appalling. It will form a part of the business of this discourse, to show, that the doctrine of sovereignty has nothing to do with the final reprobation of any part of the world; and that, when correctly understood, it opposes no known principle of the divine government, nor represents Deity in an unamiable point of light.

In conducting this discourse, with special reference to the objects which I have in view, I shall be less solicitous than usual to maintain a conformity to the common rules of sermonizing. I shall briefly state the doctrine, as it has generally been understood; and then present such views of it, as I conceive the Scriptures give, and sound reason supports.

It is alledged, that the Supreme Being is alone entitled to the creatures he has made, and to all their services; that he possesses a perfect and unlimited right to do with any or all of them as he pleases in time and eternity; that in his dealings with them here, and in fixing their eternal state, he consults not what we call justice or benevolence, nor acts with the remotest reference to the felicity of individuals; and that he does nothing because it is right, but, every thing is right because he does it. Hence, the conclusion is drawn, that if all mankind had been left to perish eternally without remedy, it would have been right. But when God is pleased, in the exercise of sovereign grace, to elect and save a part, he does no wrong to those whom he leaves to perish. These, I believe are the leading and distinguishing traits in the character of the doctrine, as it has been, and is still understood by many.

At the first view of these ideas, we are spontaneously led to the following reflection; that they form the foundation upon which, in every age, tyranny and despotism have erected their systems, and carried them into operation with the greatest and most melancholy effect. I do not say this to prejudice you against the doctrine, before it has had a full trial, much less to give birth to feelings against those who maintain the doctrine; that are incompatible with the enlarged charity of the gospel: but to show that such ideas are presented under a very unpromising and most appalling aspect. Their abettors are as sensible of this as we can be; and accordingly never fail to make large provision against the impression, that they feel their system must make upon tender and sympathetic minds. They are careful to furnish a salvo for this unfavorable impression, in the doctrine of an entire and unreserved submission to the sovereign will of God, though that will should be exercised in dooming to wrath the dearest charities of life, or even the believer of the doctrine himself. But here, the system appears to deviate from its great principles; for it makes this unqualified

submission to the divine will, the prerequisite and proof of the subject's salvation. If, however, God saves the sinner in a completely sovereign way, we see not how there can be any reference at all to his feelings or dispositions, as in proportion as there is reference to them, it takes so much from the doctrine of sovereignty, as it has been explained, and places salvation much upon the same ground as any other scheme, or even as Arminianism might predicate it.

But this doctrine has another characteristic that demands our notice. It either confounds right and wrong, or denies that they are recognized in the divine administration. Deity does nothing because it is right, in itself; but that which he does must necessarily be right, because he does it. Power is supposed to give the right to do any thing, and to sanction whatever is done. In expressing my own views of this point, I should say, that it is extremely unnatural to suppose that he, from whom all justice, equity and righteousness emanate, and from whom alone we derive our knowledge of the existence of these principles, should have no regard to them in the administration of his government. It would equally surprise me to learn, that justice, equity, and righteousness, are different things with God from what they are with man. Nor am I able to conceive, without indulging in feelings of impiety and irreverence, at which the soul ought to tremble, that the Great Legislator of the universe can ever counteract or violate his own laws. "It is impossible for God to lie," because he is the fountain of truth. It is equally impossible he should derogate, in his administration, from the rules and principles which we have received from him to govern our conduct; nor does he possess a sovereignty which can change the natures of right and wrong, or convert the one into the other. If it should be said, that the ideas that we oppose are necessary to the doctrine of sovereignty, we reply, that they may be necessary to the doctrine which makes Deity an arbitrary being; but arbitrary conduct and Divine sove-

reignty are widely different, and ought not to be confounded.

As we have stated the doctrine in question, as it has generally been understood, and noticed its principal, objectionable parts, we have brought you to a point in the discourse, at which you will naturally inquire for the supposed evidence of the truth of this system. This we shall lay before you, with such observations upon it, as will help to exhibit the doctrine of the sovereignty of God, in the light in which the scriptures and sound reason contemplate it; and this discussion will compose the last article of the discourse.

The text that we have chosen is much relied upon to support the preceding scheme. "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." This relates to the dealings of heaven with Pharaoh, particularly God's hardening his heart, that he should not let Israel go. The system before us supposes that Pharaoh's hardness of heart was superinduced; by divine agency, to render his misery in another world, more certain and dreadful. You will perceive that the text contains an antithesis, or presents two objects in contrast. These are, the exercise of mercy, and a state of hardness of heart. Now, to have the text prove the above scheme, the comparison or contrast ought to have been much stronger, and one of the objects compared should have been of a different character. It ought to have been, "he hath mercy on whom he will," and whom he will, he reprobates eternally. Besides, two things are here too evident to require proof; one is, that a man may be hardened, and yet not be cast off forever; and the other, that the text does not even imply any thing in reference to Pharaoh's future state; nor so much as intimate that he would exist hereafter. The rational inference from the passage is, that in the sense in which Pharaoh was temporarily hardened, he did not receive mercy; and this would place this declaration in class with that which speaks of the past and present state of some converted heathens; "who had not

obtained mercy, but now HAVE obtained mercy," with that which speaks of Israel, at different times, in different circumstances, "I will have mercy on her, that had not obtained mercy." It is seen, moreover, from the context, that this mercy or hardness of heart was not the effect of an act merely sovereign or arbitrary, it referred to principles, and recognised events of universal interest; "for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power on thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth." This purpose was not more extensive than benevolent; and to promote it, the hardness of Pharaoh's heart was rendered subservient.

The case of Jacob and Esau is cited in evidence of the truth of this system. "For the children being yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God, according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." These last words are a comment upon the words, "the elder shall serve the younger." We are not told that one of these persons was loved and the other hated before they were born; for this was not said of them till many hundred years after they were both dead. Nor was it said of them at all in their individual capacities, but in their national characters. That the elder should serve the younger has been verified in the history of the descendants of Jacob and Esau. For wise and extensively benevolent ends, God gave one a superiority over the other, not only in rule and authority, but in relation to the countries they inhabited. "I loved Jacob and hated Esau, and laid his mountains and heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness." This is the plain and unsophisticated relation that the Bible gives of the dealings of God with the two nations, without the least allusion to their condition in a future life.

"Hath not the potter power over the clay, to make of the same lump, one vessel to honor and another to

dishonor?" Yes, we answer, he has the power, and he possesses the right to do this. An exemplification of this we have in these words of the apostle; "for in a great house, there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but of wood and of earth, and some to honor and some to dishonor. If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel to honor, sanctified and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work." You see by this, a man is not a vessel to dishonor in a sense which precludes all change of character. Even that vessel which is marred in the hands of the potter, may be reformed, and become honorable. The various orders of society, the different stations that men fill, and the opposite pursuits they follow, are proofs of the point in question. One fills an elevated station, another is employed in one less honorable. But the honor is relative or comparative. Both persons may be equally useful, and one as much as the other subserve the general and common interest of society.

The subject requires that we place the scripture doctrine of sovereignty before you, in such a way, that its grand outlines and most prominent features may be shown at once. This will enable you to decide between it, and the scheme we have presented before.

We have previously remarked, that sovereignty is not an arbitrary system of conduct; and hence it does not suppose but God may consult the universal good, and act with reference to all his attributes, and still be a sovereign. The true definition seems to be this, that, "in the plan and administration of his moral government, Deity does not consult the will, much less the fancy and caprice of any inferior being." This constitutes him a sovereign. This represents him an independent being. I am the more satisfied with this definition, because it appears to embrace all that the scriptures convey in respect to this article, while it frees the subject from all the extravagances and inconsistencies that the world has attached to it, and at the same time corresponds to what I conceive to be

the true meaning of the word. To elucidate this definition, we will consult a parable, in which this doctrine is strikingly exhibited. A householder hired laborers for his vineyard, some of whom labored all day, and others did not commence their work till the "eleventh hour." With the first class, the householder stipulated, that they should receive a penny for their services; and with the others, he engaged only in a general way, in these words, "whatsoever is right I will give you." Here you observe, that tho the householder acts like a sovereign, yet he recognizes the principle of right, and engages to conform to it. When the laborers were paid at the end of their services, a murmuring arose, occasioned by the last hired receiving as much as the first. "Every man received a penny." Those who had wrought from the morning, considered this unjust. They were answered in this way, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good?" This is the language and conduct of a sovereign. But why? because the householder consulted no man's will but his own. But in his sovereignty, he injured no man; he did not defraud one of his pay, to give it to another; no partiality was exercised in the case. If the will of the first class of laborers had been consulted, the last would probably have received little or nothing. The same might have been the case, if the humor and opinion of the last class been inquired into. They might have wished to have engrossed all to themselves. But neither the opinion of the one, or the other was required. The man proceeded in his own course, and the rectitude of his conduct seems to have silenced every murmur.

The above is precisely the kind of sovereignty, that the carnal dislikes. That act of God which does not make one happy at another's expense, strikes many in an unfavorable manner, probably much more on account of their prejudices, than from any interred malevolence. Tell them, however, of the grace that selects here one and there another for heirs of salva-

tion, without an apparent reason for the distinction, and they are pleased with it ; this is sovereign mercy, that saves whom it will ; this the power that pardons and reprobates whom it will. It is still a curious circumstance that elected persons are, in general, the only believers in this plan of salvation. Reprobates are not predisposed to subscribe to the system. There is really something in it, that is captivating, if a man can once believe himself the subject of sovereign grace. For tho he will exclaim, "Why was I called and others rejected ?" as if he would resolve it into an act, as it were, without a cause, yet were his heart unveiled to himself, he there would discover a cause, which he has not yet seen. He would find it in the spiritual pride and haughtiness of his heart.

We are often informed that sinners are openly opposed to the sovereign mercy of God ; by which is meant that they are opposed to the system that we have been examining. We know this, and can account for it. Sinners have feelings of soul, and understanding of mind as well as other men ; and while they exercise these, they can discover no excellency in this system. But on our part, we have exhibited a scheme of sovereignty, which, we believe, is supported by reason and revelation, which good men, so called, will dislike as much as sinners dislike the other, and we have shown you the causes of their disapprobation. If the doctrine, to which we have attended, is found upon reflection to "be without partiality," if it refers every divine act to a rule of conduct perfectly wise and benevolent, and represents Deity as consulting the welfare of the universe, in all his dealings, tho the will of men nor angels be not consulted, we believe this doctrine will receive the unqualified assent of the understanding, the will, and affections of rational men. It is a scheme which the wicked cannot despise, nor the spiritually proud pervert to corrupt and dangerous purposes.

For the Christian Repository.

ORTHODOXY ENRAGED.

Mr. EDITOR,

I wish to communicate through the medium of your useful journal, to the public in general, to the watchmen upon the walls of our Zion, and particularly to those in the vicinity of New-York, an account of the following facts.

Last week, on Wednesday, I attended the (N. H.) General Association of Calvinist ministers at Acworth, which was attended by a multitude of ministers of the state of N. H. and a number from other states. The forenoon was occupied mostly in giving and receiving intelligence of the state of society and religion in this state and others. One presbyterian clergyman from the city of New-York, gave a description of the number of inhabitants and state of religion with them in that place. As an incentive or stimulus to greater exertion for the promotion of the cause of truth, (by which he would doubtless have us to understand Calvinism,) he suggested that the means of grace and religious instruction were greatly inadequate to the vast population of the city. He stated (if I rightly recollect) that there were one hundred and thirty-three thousand inhabitants, and about eighty churches which would convene upon an average nearly eight hundred people each, all of which would convene about 64,000 people at public worship on the Sabbath. I think, however, he limited the number to 58,000. But of this number he said they were not all privileged with the preaching of the gospel. The exceptions were *two Universalist Churches, one Quaker, one Catholic, and one Unitarian*; in which churches they were destitute of the ordinary means of grace, and did not enjoy the preaching of the gospel.

REMARKS.

What did this clergyman mean by saying that Universalists, Quakers, Catholics, and Unitarians in the city of New-York, did not enjoy the preaching of

the gospel, and were destitute of the ordinary means of grace? Did he mean that there were no preachers of those orders in the place? If he did, and it is really so, those orders ought to be apprized (and I hereby apprize them) that they should endeavor to obtain preachers and pastors for their flocks. But this is not what he meant: for there *are* preachers of those orders in the city of New-York; and I have reason to believe that there are pastors of some of those orders, "after God's own heart, who feed their flocks with knowledge and understanding," preaching the gospel that "God preached unto Abraham, saying, "In thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." He evidently meant to deny all of those orders of professors the name of Christians, because they do not believe and preach the dogmas of John Calvin, and sedulously maintain his five celebrated points, and the doctrine of the Trinity, &c. with the same bigoted intolerance that brought Michael Servetus and John Rogers to the stake. Perhaps had this divine explained the word *gospel* as he understands and preaches it, neither Universalists nor Unitarians would profess to preach it in that sense; but as he has not, they profess and will profess to preach the gospel as they understand it. Perhaps to suit *his* refined Calvinistic ear, the angelic annunciation to the shepherds of Bethlehem, (which Universalists, Unitarians, &c. call *gospel*.) "Fear not; for, behold, I bring you *good tidings* of great joy, which shall be unto *all people*," would have to be reversed, thus, "*Fear*; for behold I bring you *sad tidings* of great lamentation, which shall be unto *all people*, except a special elect few, whom God, out of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity, elected to everlasting life, and did enter into a covenant of grace with them—to bring them into a state of salvation by a Redeemer." This would doubtless suit his turn of mind and ideas of gospel better than the heavenly message does, provided he knew he was one of the elect, of which I suppose he has no doubt.

Would he now wish to equivocate and say he did

not mean to deny Universalists, Unitarians, &c. the name and fellowship of Christians, in his remarks. His language speaks for itself. If they were "destitute of the ordinary means of grace, and the preaching of the gospel," they certainly could not be Christians. And besides, this point was tested, the day following, at this very Association. On Thursday, as I was informed, Mr. Kneeland, pastor of the Universalist church in the city of Philadelphia, being present while they were celebrating the Lord's supper, they gave a general invitation to all Christians, members of other churches in regular standing, to partake of the communion with them. Accordingly, Mr. Kneeland kept his seat with the communicants. But "they were greatly troubled at his presence," and could not proceed till he was removed. They said they did not know him, and therefore could not consistently commune with him. He replied that he was known to many of those who were present, as he had once been the pastor of a church in a town* adjoining. But all this would not suffice. Still that bigoted spirit lurked within their breasts that says to others, "Stand by thyself, come not near me; for I am holier than thou." They then requested all to retire, except those that could subscribe to the following articles of faith, viz. total depravity of the heart, the final perseverance of the saints, regeneration by the special grace of God, the all-sufficient atonement of Christ for salvation, and the eternal punishment of the wicked.

Mr. Kneeland then observed that he could not subscribe to those articles of faith, and took his leave of them.

How far does the conduct of this Association towards Mr. Kneeland, and the observations of this clergyman before spoken of, about Universalists, and other denominations, who differed from Calvinists, come short of popery? Methinks not very far. Calvinism may be called, with propriety, the eldest

* Langdon.

daughter of popery : and if I have any skill in physiognomy, or in judging of family resemblances, the *daughter* has nearly all of the ostensible features of the *mother*. Orthodox divines should be extremely cautious in denying Catholics the name of Christians, and saying that "they are destitute of the ordinary means of grace, and the preaching of the gospel," lest it should be said to them in the language of Nathan to David, "Thou art the man." To what a deplorable condition is Orthodoxy at length reduced in this vicinity, to be necessitated thus to resort to such contemptible measures as the before-mentioned, to support the crumbling walls of her tottering fabric ! She denies those the name of Christians, who cannot in conscience subscribe to her absurd dogmas, and represents them as "destitute of the ordinary means of grace," &c. To what stratagem will she next have recourse, when she finds these fail of gaining proselytes to her system, and curbing the progress of what she calls *heresy* ? I confess I know not. She has already tried every method within her power ; and finds they all fail. Many of her votaries are already ashamed of her unjustifiable measures to support her declining system, and would gladly hide her head, (that is, John Calvin in his murdering Servetus,) imagining like the Ostrich, when her head is concealed, and she cannot see others, that she is secure, and that others cannot see her. But we may say of them as St. Paul said of certain characters that should come in the "last times," "They shall proceed no further," (without being exposed) "for their folly shall be manifested unto all men." It is doubtless for this reason that Orthodoxy thus rages, "having great wrath, because she knoweth that she hath but a short time." From such intolerance and bigotry may the Lord in mercy deliver us all.

I would not wish to be understood, in making these remarks, to be possessed of an unfriendly or uncharitable disposition towards those, on whose sentiments and conduct I have animadverted. I am only un-

friendly to their errors, and not to their persons. I expose their errors, that they and others may be enabled to forsake and avoid them; and thus forsaking error, find the truth, receive it, and walk in the love of it, and thus "the truth shall make them free."

Langdon, Sept. 12, 1823.

D. S.

From the Unitarian Miscellany.

CHRIST IN THE FORM OF GOD.

A passage in Paul's Epistle to the Philippians is quoted by trinitarians, and frequently with much confidence, in support of their doctrine. It is that in which Christ is said to have been in the form of God. This phrase, and one or two others connected with it, are supposed to imply, that the Apostle intended to represent Christ the Son to be the same as God the Father. We will quote the passage, and then endeavor to ascertain its meaning. The Apostle is enjoining love, concord, and humility on the Philippians, and to encourage them in these virtues, and especially the last, he calls their attention to the example of their divine master.

"Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Philip. ii. 6—9.

These words are often adduced as teaching the deity of Christ, and affording an argument in favor of the trinity. Before we proceed to investigate the actual sense of the passage, let us see with what show of consistency, when taken literally as it stands, it can be imagined to inculcate the notion of the equality and identity of the Father and the Son.

First, it is an unheard of use of language to speak

a person being in the form of himself. If Christ be truly the Supreme God, the same in essence and substance, the Apostle would have called him God. The thing, or person, may be said to have the form of another, when there is a general resemblance between them; but to say, that a person, or thing, is in the form of itself, is to use words without import, a species of trifling with which the Apostle can hardly be charged.

Secondly, to assert the existence of any being in the universe, who is equal to the Supreme God, is plainly to assert a plurality of Gods. To whatever degree of power and excellence you may elevate the Supreme Being, whenever you make another being equal to him, this being must be equally exalted, equally perfect. Hence, if the text actually teach, that Christ is in all respects equal to the Almighty Father, it teaches the doctrine of two Gods.

Thirdly, nor can this consequence be evaded by the supposition, that these two equal Gods are one and the same God, for such a supposition itself involves an absurdity. Two supreme beings cannot be one, any more than two men can be one. Besides, a being cannot be said to be equal to itself; equality necessarily implies more than one; and the very form of expression, that Christ is equal to God, indicates that he is not the same being.

Fourthly, suppose it to be true, that he were equal to God, with what propriety could it be called robbery to assume this equality? There can be no meaning in such language. God possesses all perfections and cannot rob himself of any thing; and, if Christ be truly God, what is here said about robbery is equally futile in sense, and derogatory to his character.

Fifthly, if to be in the form of God means, that Christ was truly God, it must be inferred from his being in the form of a servant, that he was literally a servant. The two expressions have the same import, and ought to be taken in the same extent. That is, the God of all things is made to resign the govern-

ment of the universe, and descend to the degrading condition of a servant or slave among men. What mind does not revolt at such a representation? Are we told of two natures? This is a convenient subterfuge, and nothing more. Where is any thing said of two natures? What is more evident in the present passage, than that Christ is spoken of throughout as one and the same being, possessed of one and the same nature? Moreover, in whatever nature it was that he humbled himself, it was in that nature, which made him in the form of God; but if in this nature he were truly God, how could he humble himself? God is infinite in every perfection; these perfections cannot be diminished or humbled, without destroying his character as God. It follows, that the nature of Christ was not the nature of God in any sense; and that the notion of two natures is not less inconsistent with the sense of the text than absurd in itself.

Sixthly, the trinitarian interpretation of this passage is at variance with the spirit and purpose of the context. The apostle is inculcating humility, and cites the example of Christ. But does it imply any humility in Christ to say, that he thought it not robbery to be equal with God? on the contrary, could any thing be farther removed from the true characteristics of humility? What could argue a higher presumption and self consequence, than to claim equality with God?

From these considerations, two things are manifest. The first is, that whatever may be the meaning of the passage, the trinitarian interpretation is erroneous; and the second, that the passage itself in the common translation is inconsistent in its parts. This will be more obvious by a further examination.

As to the phrase, *form of God*, we have already seen, that it cannot signify the essence, or nature of God. Except in this passage, the word here rendered *form* occurs only once in the New Testament. "After that, he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked and went into the country." Mark. xvi. 12.

No one will suppose from these words, that he came in another nature, or as another being. He only assumed a different external appearance from that in which he had previously appeared to Mary Magdalene, who took him for a gardener. So in the present instance, the word must mean a resemblance of some sort, either real or figurative, and not an identity of nature. In this respect it has an appropriate signification, and one illustrative of the character of the Savior.

He sustained the form, or resemblance of God, in his glory and excellence. He was highly exalted, and received more abundantly the divine gifts than any other being. In knowledge, wisdom, and holiness, in every moral attribute and perfection, he resembled God. In the power he possessed, in the command he had over nature and men, in his miracles, and in all his works of benevolence and love, compassion and mercy, he was in the form of God. In all the marks of excellence, which distinguished him so highly, he approached the perfections, and bore the likeness of his heavenly Father.*

* *Ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ*, in the form of God, Hesychius defines *μορφή* by *ἵμας, ideo*; and Schleusner's definition is, *forma, omne quod in oculis occurrit, imago, similitudo*. It denotes the appearance of a thing, as distinct from its internal essence or nature. It is thus several times used in the Septuagint. *Ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ὡς μορφήν ἀνθρώπου*, he made it after the form, or figure of a man. *Isai. xlv. 13.* *Καὶ ἡ μορφή σου μὴ ἀλλοιωθῇ*, and let not thy form or appearance, be changed. *Dan. v. 10.* In this sense the word is five times found in the book of Daniel. Hammond has endeavored to prove, that the word is used by good authors, *pro interna ipsa rerum essentia vel forma*; but the labor with which he has pursued this undertaking evinces its difficulty. And after all, he has done no more, than render it probable, that the word has been sometimes thus employed in a figurative and loose sense, and as an exception to its customary use. And Le Clerc has well observed, that admitting his deductions to be accurate, it does not follow, that the word here has the signification, which he endeavors to prove it capable of admitting. *Quamvis id significaret quod vult noster, non sequeretur in hac phrasi idem sonare. Vid. Adnotat. in Loc.* In the Notes to

Next, in regard to the phrase, *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*, it is a faulty translation. This is plain from its very import, as hinted above, unless we are willing to charge the Apostle with having used words without meaning, as well as in contradiction to his chief design. Why should it be said, that Christ thought it not robbery to be what he was necessarily by nature; or why should the assumption of equality with the Supreme God be adduced as an evidence of humility? Let the text be rightly translated, and no room will be left for these unanswerable questions, nor will any darkness rest on the language of the Apostle. "Christ, being in the form of God, did not consider this likeness to God, as a booty, eagerly to be retained." In other words, although he possessed those extraordinary powers, which gave him so strong a resemblance to God, yet he was not disposed to claim them as his own, nor was he forward to make such a display of them as to indicate, that he felt himself exalted above other men.*

his Translation of the New Testament, Le Clerc says the phrase means *la ressemblance de Dieu*, the resemblance of God.

*There is a difference of opinion among the learned concerning the signification of the word *απαγμιος*, translated *robbery*, in the common version. Very few critics, however, contend for this meaning in its present connexion. It is susceptible of a passive and an active sense. It may mean the act of plundering, or the thing plundered, the act of seizing or the thing seized. As defined by Schleusner, it is either *ipsa rapina*, *actio*, or *res auidē diripienda*. In the present instance it seems to have the latter sense, as expressed in the Vulgate translation, which has it, *non rapinam arbitratus est*, he did not think it plunder. That is, he did not wish to retain his likeness to God as a thing, which he had forcibly seized, and of which he held an undoubted possession; but as it was entirely the gift of God, he was willing to be divested of it except so far as it should be requisite to accomplish the great object of his mission.

That learned critic and commentator, Mr. Pierce, says, "I cannot but add but what I think very material, that not one of the primitive christians, who lived before the Council of Nice, as far as appears, understood this phrase in the same way that our translators do." Le Clerc translates the verse as follows;

This sense of the text is in perfect harmony with what follows. He "made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant." That is, instead of being elated with his vast superiority above all other men, and using his miraculous powers to give him worldly eminence, he voluntarily brought himself down to a level with persons of the humblest condition, with whom he lived and conversed. He laid aside the greatness of his power, and veiled the brightness of his glory, and not only dwelt with the poor and unfortunate, but submitted to the same circumstances, and endured the same privations. Nor did he stop here; but for the good of mankind, he suffered reproach and persecution, and yielded to a cruel and ignominious death.*

Etant en forme de Dieu, il ne crut pas que s'égaler a Dieu fut une chose qu'on put ravir. Wetstein ascribes to *αὐταπαύσας* the same meaning as Schleusner.

As to the phrase *ὡς Θεός*, rendered in the common version, *equal to God*, Whitby says it means, "to be, or to appear, as God, or in the likeness of God;" and he adds, that the word *ὡς* is frequently used adverbially. This he proves by many quotations from the Septuagint. Schlichtingius had before done the same. *Neutrum plurale more Græcorum adverbialiter capitur. Latini dicerent, quod esset ceu Deus, aut æque ac Deus, vel instar Dei.* Vid. Schlicht. Comment. in loc. Macknight follows Whitby, and Rosenmuller agrees with Schlichtingius. This sense of the word takes away the absurdity of making another being equal to God, and thus giving countenance to the doctrine of two Gods. Likeness, or resemblance, admits of no comparison, and however nearly one being may approach to another in this respect, it does not necessarily follow that they are equal.

* The phrase *ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν*, *he made himself of no reputation*, means literally, *he emptied, or divested himself*. That is, he divested himself of his resemblance to God, or refrained from an ostentatious exercise of those miraculous powers, in which this likeness to God consisted.

Taking the form of a servant, *μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν*. Instead of assuming the control over others, which his dignity and power enabled him to assume, and instead of seeking his own elevation and aggrandizement, he walked in the humble ranks of life, condescending to the offices, and submitting to the treatment of a servant.

These features in the character and life of our Saviour, are brought to the minds of the Philippians, as testimony of his humility, and as affording an illustrious example for them to follow. In connection with the two preceding verses, the passage under consideration may be thus paraphrased :

"Let nothing be done among you in the spirit of contention and vain glory, but let each one cherish modesty and humility, esteeming others better than himself. Let no one be devoted exclusively to his own interests, but rather let every one contribute to the benefit of others. Preserve the same temper and disposition which prevailed in Christ, who, altho he resembled God in his extraordinary powers and qualities, yet he did not consider these gifts as his own, nor did he use them to promote selfish motives, or to show his ascendancy above others. He even refrained from any exercise of his miraculous powers on his own account, divested himself of his greatness, and became in appearance like other men. He descended to the humblest offices of life, was familiar with poverty and grief, and at last, to accomplish his great purpose of benevolence to men, he voluntarily suffered death by the wicked hands of his persecutors."

To conclude, among the controverted texts it may be doubted whether there be one, which can with more propriety than this be forced into a sanction of the trinitarian doctrine. As far as it proves any thing on the subject, it is, that the Son is a distinct being from the Father, and of a subordinate nature.

PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE IN FAVOR OF UNIVERSAL SALVATION. No. 1.

Gen. iii. 15. "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

xii. 2, 3. "And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and

thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

xxii. 15—18. "And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven, the second time, and said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son; that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice."

xxvi. 3, 4. "Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, (Isaac,) and I will bless thee; for unto thee, and unto thy seed, will I give all these countries; and I will perform the oath which I swore unto Abraham thy father: and I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of the heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries: and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."

xxviii. 12, 13, 14. "And he (Jacob) dreamed, and behold a ladder set upon the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and, behold, the angels of God ascending and descending on it; and, behold, the Lord stood above it, and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham, thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed; and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth; and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

Heb. vi. 13—19. "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself, saying, Surely, blessing I will bless thee; and multiplying I will multiply thee. And so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men verily swear by the greater, and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto

the heirs of promise the immutability of his covenant confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have strong consolation, who have fled for refuge, lay hold upon the hope set before us; which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil."

REMARKS.

In the first of these passages, the curse upon the serpent implies a blessing on mankind. This is different from the conduct of some men, who curse mankind, and thereby speak a blessing on the serpent. The serpent is to have his head bruised by the seed of the woman. This is his destruction. Christ partook of flesh and blood, "that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their life time subject to bondage," Heb. ii. 14, 15. Thus we see the devil is to be *destroyed*, and his captives *delivered*. A bruise of the heel is generally curable. And if the devil infuses poison when he wounds, "the balm of Gilead," and "the physician" that "came not to destroy men's lives but to save them," afford a sufficient antidote to counteract the deadly influence, and save the languishing patient.

On the other passages, we notice that the seed is explained by St. Paul to be Christ. Gal. iii. 16. All the families and nations of the earth are called all the *kindreds* of the earth. Acts iii. 25. In this same passage the blessing is explained to consist in "*turning away every one of you from his iniquities.*" This must be a spiritual blessing, for none can be turned away from iniquity, and be in iniquity at the same time.

ON JUDGING JUSTLY.

A perfectly just and sound mind is a rare and invaluable gift. But it is still much more unusual to

such a mind unbiassed in all its actions. God has given this soundness of mind but to few; and a very small number of those escape the bias of some predilection, perhaps habitually operating; and none are, at all times, and perfectly, free. I once saw this subject forcibly illustrated. A watchmaker told me that a gentleman had put an exquisite watch into his hands, that went irregularly. It was as perfect a piece of work as was ever made. He took it to pieces, and put it together again twenty times. No manner of defect was to be discovered, and yet the watch went intolerably. At last it struck him, that, possibly, the balance wheel might have been near a magnet. On applying a needle to it, he found his suspicions true. Here was all the mischief. The steel work in the other parts of the watch had a perpetual influence on its motions; and the watch went as well as possible with a new wheel. If the soundest mind be MAGNETIZED by any predilection, it must act irregularly.—*Cecil's Remains.*

Communicated for the Christian Repository.

RELIGIOUS CONFERENCE BETWEEN A CONGREGATIONALIST AND A UNIVERSALIST.

Not long since, I attended a religious conference, which took place agreeable to previous appointment, between Mr. K. a Congregational clergyman, and Mr. B. a Universalist. We met at the house of Mr. K. where a few only of the particular friends were admitted an audience (as it was not designed to be very public) and after usual civilities, the conference was introduced as follows.

Mr. K. begged the privilege of asking a few questions, as introductory to the proposed conference, which was granted by Mr. B. Question 1st, Do you believe in the Christian religion? Ans. I do. Upon which Mr. K. observed, that they were agreed in this point, and that therefore there was no room for argu-

ment. Mr. B. observed, that notwithstanding they might be agreed in this, there were other points upon which he apprehended they materially differed, when Mr. K. wished to ask another question—Does Mr. B. believe that every word and syllable, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation, was spoken or written by divine inspiration? Ans. No. Upon which Mr. K. very hastily observed, there was no use in proceeding any further, as Mr. B. denied the Bible, he wished not to converse with an infidel. Mr. B. proceeded to explain; he did not deny the validity of the Scriptures; he believed them to be a true record; but he could not admit that what the script said to our first parents, in the garden of Eden, "Ye shall not surely die;" the accusations brought against Job by his three friends, in which they accused him of robbing and oppressing the widow and fatherless, when God said that he was a perfect and upright man, one that feared him and eschewed evil; the accusations brought by the pharisees against our Savior, when they said he did not cast out devils but by Beelzebub, the prince of devils; neither the cavils of wicked men, a faithful history of which is there recorded; are given by divine inspiration. He would admit that all that was written or spoken by the prophets, in the Psalms, by Jesus Christ, or his apostles, that was not historical, was given by divine inspiration. He said, I do not believe, neither do you, Mr. K. that the cavils of wicked men, a faithful record of which is found in the Bible, is or could be given by divine inspiration, any more than I do. Mr. K. wished to know how Mr. B. could reconcile the following passage, 2 Tim. iii. 16, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine," &c. with the idea he had advanced. To which Mr. B. answered, that by leaving out the word *is*, which was supplied by the translators, the passage would be plain and easily understood. Then it would read as follows: "All scripture, given by inspiration," &c. which would render the passage unambiguous. Mr.

K. affirmed, that the word *is* was necessarily understood, from which Mr. B. again dissented. This question was left unsettled, and Mr. K. proceeded to observe, that it was very unsafe for him to proceed with a man who thus denied the Bible; that in this way a man could prove any thing from the Bible; he could prove that it was right to murder, to commit suicide. One passage says, "that Judas went out and hanged himself;" another, "go thou and do likewise." Mr. B. denied the possibility of such proof; said, that such deductions were not logical; at least, he was unacquainted with such logic. After some observations made by each in regard to the period in which, the manner how, and the persons by whom the scriptures were compiled, and the medium through which they were preserved through the reign of popery, the manner of their dissemination through christendom, Mr. B. proceeded to advance three propositions, as follows:

1st. God originally willed and determined the final salvation of all men.

2d. Christ hath undertaken to effect or execute his Father's will.

3d. Christ will never fail; but will succeed in the full accomplishment of his Father's will. Mr. K. objected to the first proposition. He said that God originally designed that he that believeth should be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned. Mr. B. after making an additional statement that God is of one mind, and changes not, (to which Mr. K. assented,) proceeded agreeable to Mr. K.'s request to establish his first proposition by scripture testimony; viz. that God originally willed and determined the salvation of all men. The first passage adduced in proof is found in Eph. i. 9, 10, "Having made known unto us, [*the Church at Ephesus,*] the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself; [*now hear the will according to the good pleasure of God,*] that, in the dispensation of the fulness of time, he might gather together in *one* all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on

earth, even in him." Mr. K. denied that the passage meant *all* men. He inquired what Mr. B. meant by *all things* in the passage, to which he replied, *all men*. Mr. K. remarked, The passage did not mean *all men*, it says *all things*. Be it so, says Mr. B. it proves enough for my purpose, if a man is a thing, and a man is a thing; therefore, it proves the salvation of all men. Mr. K. says, I wish the people all to understand Mr. B.'s explanation of scripture, he has proved according to his explanation, that hogs, and dogs, chipmucks* and squirrels, rabbits and skunks, axes and hoes, barns and logs, snakes and toads, are all going to heaven at last, as well as wicked men and devils. If such an explanation is allowable, we can prove any thing by scripture. One passage says, "Judas went out and hanged himself," and another says, "Go and do likewise," in this way we can prove it is right to murder. No, says Mr. B. we cannot. To understand scripture, three things are indispensably necessary to be observed; 1st. the person speaking, 2d. the person spoken to, 3d. the subject with its connexions on which he or they are speaking, together with the time *when*. Mr. B. proceeded, and read another passage, 1st Tim. ii. chapter from 1st to the 6th verse inclusive. "I exhort, therefore, that first of all, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time." Mr. K. considered this passage as altogether inadequate to prove Mr. B.'s first proposition. He again affirmed that God never did will any thing further, with regard to the creature, than his salvation upon the

* Our speaker, in his catalogue of heavenly inhabitants, has nearly outstript the bounds of lexicography; for we cannot tell whose dictionary describes a *chipmuck*.
EDITOR.

condition of his belief ; or damnation, upon the condition of unbelief. Question by Mr. B. Is God's will dependent upon man's, or is man's will dependent on God's? would not all come if God moved upon all alike?—Ans. I do not know.—Question by Mr. K. Does not the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew allude to the last judgement?—Ans. No. He said it had allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem, where a separation did actually take place between the believing and unbelieving Jews, where every one whose name was found written in the book, was delivered, and the rest were given up to slaughter, to captivity, and darkness. He said the 25th chapter was only a continuation of the 24th, the chapter commencing with the word *then*, which is an adverb of time, and had reference to what immediately preceded. From the 24th which he read, he attempted to prove that Jesus Christ did come at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, by the answer which our Savior gave to the three questions proposed by his disciples in the 3d verse ; when Jerusalem should be destroyed, what should be the sign of his coming, and the end of the world ; then it was that the abomination of desolation, spoken by Daniel the prophet should be fulfilled ; all of which from the parable of the fig-tree with the subsequent observations of our Savior he considered would assuredly be fulfilled in the then present generation. See 34th verse, "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled ;" that is, Jerusalem should be destroyed, Jesus should come, the end of the world, or the conclusion of the age or Jewish dispensation, should take place, before that generation should have passed away. As a proof that some, even of his disciples, did live until his second coming, he introduced the words of our Savior to Peter the last time that he appeared to his disciples after his resurrection. St. John xxi. 22, 23. "Jesus saith unto him, if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die ; yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die : but if I will

that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee ?” The coming of our Savior, spoken of in Matthew, xxv. 31. “When the son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him ; then, (when ? *when he shall* come, the same coming spoken of in the 24th chapter) shall he sit upon the throne of his glory ; and before him (Jesus) shall be gathered all nations ; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats.” As an additional proof that the 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew spoke of the same coming of our Savior, he introduced Matt. xii. 27, 28. “For the son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels ; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily, I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the son of man coming in his kingdom.” He said it was easy to see that the coming spoken of in the 25th and 16th chapters are the same, for in both cases he came with his angels, and for the same purpose, to reward every man according to his works. And the writer of this article cannot resist the conclusion that the coming spoken of in the 16th and 24th chapters are the same, if there is any meaning in language, because both are to take place in the lifetime of the then present generation. And if it is true that the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, and much more the ungodly and sinner, as Solomon declares, we can see the propriety of the following scriptures, “the judgement is set,” &c. “Now is the judgement of this world.” To this Mr. K. strenuously objected, he denied all connexion between the 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew, called upon the people (holding up his Bible) to see that there was a paragraph between the two comings spoken of ; telling them that every one knew that a paragraph began a new subject. He admitted the 24th was already fulfilled ; but contended that the 25th would not be until after the general resurrection of the dead. He at the same time observed, that he only wished to get Mr. B.’s opinion, that the people might see his perversion of scripture.

[*To be continued.*]

DISSERTATIONS ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

No. IV.

Having in a previous number introduced a few passages of scripture, which, in our view, clearly support the doctrine of a future retribution, we will now make it a business to consider a particular ground of argument, which our opposers frequently adopt on this subject. Those who deny all future punishment, generally deny the intermediate state of conscious existence between death and the resurrection. To this idea, however, there may be a number of exceptions. Considering the resurrection from the dead an immediate introduction to a state of immortality, they argue from the state of the case, according to their views of it, that there can be no punishment or suffering. They sometimes say, immortality can possess nothing but purity, and of course it would be unjust that such a being should suffer, allowing that it were possible to inflict suffering. But, if we mistake not, they usually contend that such a state, from its very nature, is utterly beyond the reach of suffering.

In meeting this ground of the argument, we are not insensible of the strong prejudices which we may have to encounter; nor should we marvel, if some readers should now be almost tempted to shut up their book, and read no further,—not because they properly anticipate our labor, but because they suppose, we are about to attack that which none but fools would attempt. Were we now writing to the believers in endless misery on the subject of universal salvation, and in the course of argument, should state that we believed there might be an alteration for the better after death, we should soon find that some would shrink with horror at our undertaking. *No alteration after death* has been in so many mouths, believed by so many denominations, and has stood so long an exalted mound between protestantism and popery, that it has acquired, in many minds, the full sanction of divine inspiration. In approaching it in their

society, a man does it at his peril. He is in danger of being thought either a fool or mad. Notwithstanding, we who believe in the salvation of all men, discern nothing in the Bible that stumbles us in relation to this subject.

God is alone strictly and necessarily *immortal*, both as it respects the nature of his existence and his attributes. The immortality of created beings, in their highest state of perfection, must be different from his. When we consider creatures immortal as the Creator is, we make them so many independent beings. But to consider men or angels, in their most exalted state, independent beings, is an idea most irrational and absurd. "All thy works," says the Psalmist, "shall praise thee, and thy saints shall bless thee." We cannot conceive that it is possible for any being to make or create a thing so perfect, that he is unable to destroy it himself. Some beings may sometimes destroy things that they are unable to make, but no one is ever able to make what he cannot destroy. It follows then that man's future immortality will not be such a state that the Almighty cannot destroy him; but a state, the natural principles of which will unceasingly continue, if not counteracted by a power superior to its own. The natural sense of *immortality* is simply an exemption from death, and no more. The word is from the Latin *in*, contrary to, and *mons*, death. The corresponding Greek word, *athanasia* (*athanasia*) being from *a*, (*a*) not, and *thanatos* (*thanatos*) death, is literally of the same signification with the English word, *immortality*. This word is used in only three texts in the New Greek Testament. 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54, and 1 Tim. vi. 16. There are two other places, where the word *immortality* is used, Rom. ii. 7, and 2 Tim. i. 10; but it is here made the translation of another Greek word, that literally signifies *incorruption*. The latter word may frequently comprehend spiritual qualifications; but the former we think alludes, and, most probably, solely to the principles of physical existence. We find it once applied to the Deity, and twice to man in his resurrection state.

When we say immortality, attached to created beings, necessarily implies spiritual purity, are we pronouncing a self-evident proposition, or humbly begging a question? Does any mortal know by experience, that immortality or incorruption, applied to the principles of existence, necessarily implies immortal or unfading holiness? Certainly not. The subject is beyond his present experience. Is the idea proveable from scripture? Then let some skilful hand produce the proof, and this point will be placed beyond all controversy. If it can be proved that spiritual holiness is universally the direct consequence of physical operations, we acknowledge the point will be maintained; but it will involve us in another difficulty respecting the proper office of the mediatorship of Jesus Christ. "It is written in the prophets," says Jesus, "And they shall all be taught of God. Every man, therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." John vi. 45. Those physical operations that affect material existence, we conceive to be different and distinct from the exercise of being taught, learning, and coming unto Christ.

St. Paul says, "I have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." We can have no clearer scripture testimony of the present distinction of just and unjust among men, existing at the time of the resurrection than is here afforded us.—Now we must conclude that the resurrection, in its own physical but mighty operation, affects a spiritual change in the souls of the unjust, or there will be just and unjust, after the resurrection. But as we discern no proper reason why we should admit this, we conclude there will be both just and unjust after the resurrection. On this subject, we will now quote John v. 28, 29: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

The writer of this article is not insensible, that his brethren, in general, give a very different construction to the above cited passage than they find in this application of it. He would, by no means, plead ignorance of their writings on this subject; for he believes he has read the greater part of them which have been published in this country. They usually understand the passage figuratively, and give it nearly the same application as they do the preceding 25th and 26th verses. Let us then proceed to notice some essential marks of difference. In the first he says, "The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and *they that* hear shall live." From this passage it appears, *all live* who hear, but *all* do not hear. But in the other, "*All* that are in their graves hear;" but *all* do not *live*; that is, are not holy and happy: Some come forth to *life*, and some to *damnation*, or more properly, *condemnation*. Here we discern a striking difference, which leads to the conclusion that each passage should have a very different application. Of the last passage, we further observe, it does not appear that it has ever yet been fulfilled, according to a figurative or literal interpretation. Can it be said, all that are in their graves have heard the voice of Jesus? Allowing the graves to be figurative, the application that many have given, it does not appear to justify the use of its language. It does not appear that *all* have come forth from any kind of graves whatever, by the voice of Jesus, either to life or condemnation. If we are correct in this remark, its exclusive application to the Jewish age cannot be just. Besides this, we never could see the propriety of a spiritual resurrection to condemnation. To call an excitement to a sense of guilt a resurrection, seems altogether unworthy of the term.

We are well aware that the idea of a literal resurrection, some to life, and some to condemnation, is frequently opposed by citing St. Paul's account of the resurrection in the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians; but by a careful comparison we do not find the one contradictory to the other. In Corinthians, to be sure,

we find no account of condemnation ; but its silence on this subject affords no argument that our Savior's words are not literally true. By making some exceptions apply to *all* men, which we think was not meant by the Apostle, and others to signify spiritual properties, which we conclude, were intended to denote those which are corporeal, our brethren have made the language of St. Paul on this subject to oppose the literal expressions of our Lord. Our limits will not permit us, at this time, to enter into a particular discussion of this part of our subject, which would require a dissertation of itself ; but we calculate, the Lord willing, to resume it, some future day, and offer our ideas on some of the most important parts of this chapter.

It may not be improper, before we close this article, to offer a few remarks on the relative connexion between the present and a future state. It is generally thought that the present is designed as a proper introduction to the future. We may expect then, in the future state, to retain a knowledge of our personal identity in the present. The natural meaning of a resurrection presupposes the idea. If a consciousness of our present existence is not retained, what prospect could a future state afford us ? It can differ but little in prospect, from no future state at all. Let an individual reflect, tho I am to live, yet I am not to know that it is I ; and therefore, when I depart this life, it may be the last knowledge that I shall have of myself. What can such a scene present to the individual, (even allowing a future state of endless felicity but an unconsciousness of the present,) but an everlasting farewell, at death, of all that the eyes have seen, or the understanding has comprised ? St. Paul speaks of "the crown of righteousness" that was laid up for him, and for those that love the appearing of Jesus Christ ; likewise of "a desire to depart and be with Christ," which, he says, is far better than to abide here. If in a future state he did not expect to know, in the enjoyment of the crown of righteousness and in the society of his Savior, that it was Paul that enjoyed these favors would any one account for his "desire to depart ?"

In relation to men's receiving punishment in a future state for crimes committed in this, so strenuously opposed by the deniers of future punishment, we remark, that if the future affords no conscious identity of the present, we are willing to admit, that future punishment would be unjust. On the other hand, notwithstanding all that has been written to the contrary, we see no more impropriety in men's being punished in a future state for crimes committed in this, than for Joseph's brethren to be punished in Egypt for selling him from the land of Canaan, some years after the act of selling him. "The wages of sin is death." "To be carnally minded, is death." Wages are generally bestowed after their labor. So death is consequent on sin. The sinner, therefore, is to receive punishment after his crime. Whether it be wholly or in part immediately consequent, is only at the disposal of him who "is righteous in all his ways, and holy in all his works." To undertake to cavil against the scripture account of the doctrine of punishments, illy becomes the faithful believer in divine revelation. We ought to be careful to meet the scriptures with the deference and respect that becomes the dignity of their character, as the inspired revelation of God's will. The scripture account of punishment, we have, in former numbers, endeavored, in some measure, to lay before our readers. This we have done, not for the sake of contention, but to exhibit the testimony of what we conceive to be truth, and a truth in which we consider mankind deeply interested. *Let no man, therefore, despise the chastening of the Lord. Vengeance belongeth unto me, and I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people.*

For the Repository.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

In the Repository of December last, two pieces came before the public, one called "An Appeal to the public," and the other a "Declaration." This latter

was signed "JACOB WOOD, in behalf of others." The former was signed "RESTORATIONIST."

These pieces drew some remarks from the Editors of the Magazine, found in their papers for January and February 1. In the latter they have inserted the following note from me. "Since writing this, we have received a line from Br. Briggs, disclaiming all concern with the *Appeal*." This note was founded upon a letter I wrote to the Senior Editor, stating that I had no agency in the "*Appeal*." I however, further stated that I was concerned in the writing and publishing of the "*Declaration*." And had the Editors of the Magazine given a larger extract, this public notice would have been unnecessary; but having learned, that the public do generally view me as abandoning my faith, (occasioned undoubtedly by that note) I deem it a duty which I owe to myself, and to my brethren, to give this public notice, *certifying that I did then, and do now consider myself ONE of the Authors of the Declaration*. As it respects the *Appeal*, of itself, I had no agency.

Considering myself in this light, I remark, that had the Committee appointed by the Honorable Body who met in the *South*, and who, in our absence pronounced their censure, written to me, they would before now have known my views on this subject, and saved me this trouble.

Please to give this a place in your next Repository, and confer a favor on

LEVI BRIGGS.

Westminster, Mass. Sept. 19, 1823.

[Selected.]

DRUNKENNESS.

If you wish to be always thirsty, be a Drunkard—for the oftener and more you drink, the oftener and more thirsty you will be.

If you seek to prevent your friends raising you in the world, be a Drunkard—for that will defeat all their efforts.

If you would effectually counteract your own attempts to do well, be a Drunkard—and you will not be disappointed.

If you are determined to be poor, be a Drunkard—and you will soon be poor and penniless.

If you wish to starve your family, be a Drunkard—for that will consume the means of their support.

If you would be imposed on by knaves, be a Drunkard—for that will make their task easy.

If you wish to be robbed, be a Drunkard—which will enable the thief to do it with more safety.

If you wish to blunt your senses, be a Drunkard—and you will soon be more stupid than an ass.

If you would become a fool, be a Drunkard—and you will soon lose your understanding.

If you wish to unfit yourself for rational intercourse, be a Drunkard—for that will render you wholly unfit for it.

If you are resolved to kill yourself, be a Drunkard—that being a sure mode of destruction.

If you would expose both your folly and secrets, be a Drunkard—and they will soon run out as the liquor runs in.

If you are strong, be a Drunkard—and you will soon be subdued by so powerful an enemy.

If you would get rid of your money without knowing how, be a Drunkard—and it will vanish insensibly.

If you would have no resource when past labor, be a Drunkard—and you will be unable to provide any.

If you would be a pest to society, be a Drunkard—and you will be avoided as infectious.

MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF UNIVERSALISTS OF THE NEW-ENGLAND STATES, AND OTHERS, SEPTEMBER, 1823.

The General Convention of Universalists of the New-England States, and others, agreeably to the adjournment of their last session, assembled at the

village of Clinton, N. Y. on Wednesday, Sept. 17th, 1823, and opened the business of the Council with prayer by Br. A. Kneeland.

1. Chose Br. A. Kneeland, Moderator.

2. Chose Brs. R. Carrique, and N. Stacy, Clerks.

3. Appointed Brs. H. Ballou, C. G. Parson, and Wm. Underwood, a committee to attend to all requests for fellowship or ordination.

4. Order of public service for Wednesday morning.

Introductory prayer by Br. A. Kneeland.

Sermon by Br. R. Carrique, from Rom. viii. 31.

"What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us?"

Br. H. Roberts concluding prayer.

5. Afternoon service.

Introductory prayer by Br. H. Ballou, sermon by Br. P. Morse, from St. John vi. 15. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

Concluding prayer by Br. N. Stacy.

6. Resolved that a committee be appointed to receive and present all complaints and other important business, properly coming before this Convention.

7. Appointed Brs. Wm. Underwood, N. Stacy, E. Ferris, C. G. Parson, and J. S. Flagler, the above Committee.

8. Attended to the Reports of the several committees appointed at the last session of this Convention to visit the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern Associations—which reports were highly interesting to the lovers of truth, as they gave evidence that our societies are generally flourishing, and that the cause of gospel truth is rapidly advancing.

9. Appointed committees to visit Associations in fellowship with this Convention.

Northern Association, Brs. R. Streeter, A. Kinsman, and R. Bartlett.

Southern Association, Brs. R. Carrique, H. Ballou 2d, and D. Pickering.

Western Association, Brs. G. B. Lisher, R. Carrique, and S. R. Smith.

Eastern Association, Brs. R. Streeter, S. Streeter, and Wm. A. Drew.

10. The committee appointed to receive all complaints, &c.—presented two complaints, the first from Br. H. Ballou, 2d, against Br. P. Dean—the second from Br. C. Hudson, against Br. H. Ballou, of Boston.

Received requests from the Society in Stafford and Le Roy, and also from the Society in Pawlet and Wells, to be received into the fellowship of this Convention.

Voted to grant said requests.

12. The council proceeded to an examination of the charge against Br. P. Dean.

Adjourned the trial until Thursday morning.

The council then proceeded to the examination of the complaint against Br. H. Ballou.

13. Adjourned to 7 o'clock Thursday morning, prayer by Br. Wm. Underwood.

14. Thursday morning opened the council according to adjournment.

Prayer by Br. J. Foster.

15. Received a request from the Franklin Association of Universalists recently formed in the western part of Massachusetts to be received into the fellowship of this convention.

Voted that said request be granted.

16. Appointed Brs. H. Ballou, 2d. and H. H. Winchester, a committee to visit the Franklin Association at its next session.

17. Proceeded to trial on the complaint against Br. H. Ballou; and after attending to the evidence—voted to exonerate Br. Ballou, from the several charges preferred in the complaint.

18. Order of public service on Thursday morning.

Br. H. Sampson introductory prayer.

Br. A. Kneeland sermon from 2 Timothy iii. 16,

"All scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

Br. J. Foster concluding prayer.

19. The committee appointed to attend to requests for letters of fellowship or ordination, reported in favor of granting ordination to Br. T. F. King—and letters of fellowship to Warren Skinner, John French, and Loring Blood.

Voted that the above report be accepted.

20. Order of the afternoon service, including the solemn ordination of Br. T. F. King.

Br. H. H. Winchester introductory prayer.

Br. H. Ballou, sermon from St. John v. 38. "For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world."

Br. S. R. Smith consecrating prayer.

Br. A. Kneeland the charge.

Br. P. Morse, the right hand of fellowship.

Second sermon by Br. P. Déan from 1 Timothy iv. 16. **"Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them, for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee."**

Concluding prayer by Br. H. Ballou.

21. The Council proceeded to an investigation of the complaint against Br. Dean; and after attending to the evidences—voted to exonerate Br. Dean from the charge preferred in the complaint.

22. The committee selected by Br. Nathaniel Smith at the last session of the Western Association, to take into consideration the case of Br. Smith, reported that they had not found aught against him on which to found a complaint.

23. Voted that the former committee of discipline be continued the ensuing year.

24. Received a request from Br. P. Dean to withdraw from the fellowship of this Convention.

Voted that Br. Dean's request be granted.

25. Voted that the Minutes of this Convention, accompanied by a Circular, be published in the Herald

of Salvation, with a request that the editors of other periodical works should publish the same.

27. Appointed Br. Pitt Morse to prepare the Minutes for publication, and to accompany them with a Circular Letter.

27. Voted that this Convention be adjourned to meet in Strafford, Vermont, on the third Wednesday and Thursday in September, 1824.

Br. S. Miles returned thanks to the Almighty Disposer of all things, and the Convention adjourned.

ABNER KNEELAND, *Mod.*

RICHARD CARRIQUE, }
NATHANIEL STACY, } *Clerks.*

Ministering Brethren present.

H. Ballou, A. Kneeland, H. Ballou, 2d, N. Stacy, S. R. Smith, C. G. Parson, R. Carrique, G. B. Lisher, I. Whitnal, P. Dean, T. F. King, C. Hudson, Wm. Underwood, C. Morton, J. S. Flagler, H. Roberts, H. H. Winchester, S. Adams, A. Kinsman, A. Peck, N. Smith, P. Morse, B. Hickox, S. Miles, J. Potter, O. Ackley, S. A. Skeel, A. Vandemburgh, H. Sampson, J. Gowdy, and E. Ferriss.

Received into fellowship W. Skinner, C. French, and L. Blood.

GENERAL EPISTLE.

To all Churches, Societies, and believers in fellowship with this Convention—

To all who rejoice unspeakably in the faith of the eternal salvation of a sinful world through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus—

To all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, of every sect, name and denomination, beneath the whole canopy of heaven—

To all who know not God, and sit in the region and shadow of moral death—

To all the sons and daughters of wretchedness and want—

To all the ransomed family of mankind—

To the vast *fraternity* of intelligent beings who are

connected with each other and with the supremely glorious Author of all life by an affinity as endless as existence—

To all herein addressed, wherever this Epistle may come, the General Convention of Universalists, send salutations of heavenly peace—humbly and fervently beseeching the Father of boundless mercies to shed abroad the benign influences of his all-conquering love through our common Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who is the image of the invisible God, and the first born of every creature.

Dearly beloved Brethren,

The infinitely wise and ever gracious Parent of the universe, has kindly granted us another anniversary convocation, and has so copiously showered on us the dew of divine grace, that we feel bound to exercise unfeigned and everlasting gratitude to Him, as the great Giver of every good and perfect gift: and we most cordially invite every sincere lover of truth, and every humble disciple of the Son of God, to participate in our spiritual joys, and partake of the riches of gospel grace, prepared in infinite mercy for all people. We were received by the brethren in the faith of the common salvation at the place of our assembling, with the liveliest expression of christian affection, which were most heartily reciprocated. The business of the Council was performed with decorum, precision, and wisdom; and though certain difficulties of a nature extremely painful, were brought before us, yet we trust that the moderation, patience, and prudence which prevailed in our Council, have produced such decisions as will terminate those unhappy and unfortunate differences, and perpetuate the peace and harmony of the Order. Two of the most able and most esteemed brethren amongst us were impeached, and it must be highly gratifying to every benevolent mind that both were exonerated. The existence of such difficulties demonstrate human frailty, and afford us all an impressive lesson for our improvement. The

dissolution of our connexion with Br. Dean, according to his request, produced unutterable emotions of sorrow in our hearts ; but it seemed to be expedient. If one member of the body suffer, all the members suffer with it. However unpropitious any of these things may appear to our limited minds, we have every reason to believe, that under the direction of infinite wisdom, they are among those things which shall work together for the greatest good of all concerned. We are aware that a bigotted world is disposed to take advantage of every untoward circumstance to point the finger of derision ; but if any possess sufficient malignity to rejoice at the misfortunes of others, we beseech them seriously to consider what manner of spirit they are of. If any feel disposed to triumph because our denomination bears any mark of human imperfection—let that sect which has invariably been without difficulty among *themselves*, cast the first stone.

[*To be concluded in next No.*]

UNIVERSALISM.

There are, doubtless, multitudes of people who have a partial belief in the doctrine of universal salvation ; or who, at least, spend much of their lives in attempting to satisfy themselves of the truth of a system so pleasing to the natural temper of the heart. There are probably many others who so far succeed in attaining a belief of this doctrine, that while health continues and the prospects of life are flattering, they derive much consolation from the expectation which it encourages of certain happiness hereafter. And there may have been a few whose persuasion of its truth, and whose erroneous views of God's universal benevolence have been such as to shield them completely from the least apprehension of danger, even at the near approach of the King of terrors. We believe however that facts will testify that in most cases, the hope of the universalist as well as of the open infidel, will be cut off, and their trust will appear, even to themselves,

no better than the spider's web, when God comes to take away the soul.

We have been led to these remarks by hearing a relation of the following incident which took place recently at the state prison in this town.

A convict who was a professed universalist, but a man of considerable discernment, was confined to a sick bed. While thus situated, a pious man was led to converse with him on religious subjects, and to inquire into the nature of his hope. He expressed on this occasion a firm belief in the doctrine of universal salvation, and unlimited confidence in the mercy and goodness of God. Opportunities were repeatedly embraced to bring the subject to the mind of the sick man, and arguments used in vain to shake the ground of its belief—he constantly asserted his firm reliance on divine mercy, and his full belief that all men, on leaving this world, will be received into the arms of the Savior. This confidence continued and this hope appeared to sustain him under all his sufferings, till he was convinced that his case was dangerous and there was little or no prospect of his recovery. He then began to exhibit marks of trouble and anxiety, and at the first convenient opportunity requested his faithful friend to read and pray with him. The friend expressed surprise, and inquired, Why this concern? Where is the ground of your hope? What has become of your belief in the doctrine of universal salvation? With a heart apparently torn with grief, and eyes suffused in tears he exclaimed: Oh it is good for nothing! It is vanity! A castle built in the air, and presenting no foundation on which to rest the soul in a trying hour! Did you ever believe in the doctrine of universal salvation? I must be candid now, was the reply, I never did. Amidst all my pretension I never had confidence in its truth. It may have served at times to stifle my conscience, and in scenes of wickedness, to quiet my fears, but I never had a full belief that such a system would stand the final test. He continued anxious to attend to the bible and to hear the prayers and

pious counsel of his friend ; but to the last moments of his life deprecated in the strongest terms, the delusive and fatal error which he had formerly attempted to believe. Beware, Universalists, and avoid the pangs which rent the breast of this your brother. Before it is too late, renounce the delusive hope which you now so fondly cherish. Embrace the heavenly truths of the gospel, that you be not finally cast where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.—*N. H. Rep.*

REMARKS.

The above piece we take from "The Evangelical Monitor," which is issued from the same office, where the Christian Repository is printed. Our very faithful friend, Rev. Walter Chapin, our readers are well aware, has now and then copied a few pieces to warn us of the awful crisis which he supposes awaits us, and, if possible, to save some of us from that dreadful sentence from which there is no appeal, and those tartarian pains that never end. We sincerely thank him for all these well meant kindnesses. But if it be our misfortune to be altogether erroneous, it is equally his to give us a piece, not calculated to produce conviction.

We inquire in the first place, what is the *character* of this *poor, distracted* Universalist? We find he was a *convict* in the Newhampshire State's prison. This bespeaks his character, that he was a *wicked* man.

2d. When he was "*candid*," he said he "*never did*" believe in the "*doctrine of universal salvation*." It seems then that he had been habitually *uncandid*, and pretended to believe what he never did. This affords another proof of his wickedness, falsehood; and hypocrisy. "*Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant.*"

3. As we have this account for a Congregational story, and as the man never did believe in universal salvation, we conclude he was one of the dregs of Congregationalists, who had tried to still the upbraidings of conscience under Universalists' garments. On our part, we are glad the matter turned out as it did; for

we never supposed that Universalists' garments would cover the crimes of Congregational hypocrites.

4. The Congregationalists have done wrong in trying to palm this poor creature on us, calling him our brother; for by his own confession he was not our brother in the faith of universal salvation. "Thou sittest and speakest against *thy* brother; thou slanderest thine own mother's son. These things thou hast done, and I kept silence; thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself; but I will reprove thee, and set them in order before thine eyes." Ps. l. 20, 21.

5. Their caution to Universalists, saying, "Beware, Universalists, and avoid the pangs which rent the breast of this your brother," is very untimely and extremely preposterous. They had just told us, the man was *not* a Universalist, by his own "candid" confession. Will you receive then a caution from us? *Beware, Congregationalists, how you try to hide your iniquities, and sooth the upbraidings of conscience under the cover of universal salvation; lest the day of trial fill your souls with the pangs which rent the breast of this your brother.*"

Respecting the particular remarks, contained in the first part of this piece on universalism, our readers will judge of their merits by this unfortunate example of illustration. As it fared with old Haman, so with many of his sons; they hang on the gallows which they made for Mordecai.

MISCELLANEOUS ARTICLES.

It is said in a late London paper that a large edition of the Koran is printing by the society of Arabian Merchants, to distribute among the Mahometan tribes.

C. Register.

The Pope.—The health of His Holiness continues precarious. He is in his 82d year, having been born at Cesena, Romania, 14th Aug. 1742; was elected Pope at Venice, 14th March, 1800, and crowned the 21st of that month. His thigh bone was broken in his

late fall, and he is laboring under a compound fracture.

Later intelligence from Rome, states the death of the Pope to have taken place on the 20th of August. The news of his death was received at Paris by telegraph.

We have received another letter from our brother Worrall, Pastor of the Universalist Church in Glasgow, (Scotland,) communicating tidings of good things. Also, the two first Numbers of the "GOSPEL COMMUNICATOR," a new publication, edited by our brother Worrall, and proclaiming the "Great Salvation."

Gospel Herald.

Bernardston, Sept. 29, 1824.

+ *Franklin Association.*—The Franklin Association of Universalists convened at Br. Greenleaf's in Whitingham, Vt. agreeable to adjournment, on Wednesday the 24th of September instant.

Present, Brs. David Ballou, Hosea Ballou, Hollis Sampson, John Brooks, Hosea Ballou, 2d, and Hubbard H. Winchester.

Three sermons were preached by Brs. J. Brooks, H. Ballou, and H. Ballou, 2d.

The Association adjourned to meet at Bernardston, Mass. on the 3d Wednesday in October, 1824.

We publish in this number a religious Conference between a Universalist and Congregational minister. We may state, no doubt, with propriety, that the sentiments of the Universalist on the 25th chapter of Matthew, are those of the connexion in general; but the Editor of this work has been, of late, more inclined to doubt the correctness of the application than formerly. Our brethren contend that the whole of the 24th and 25th chapters must have been fulfilled in the age in which our Savior was upon earth; but yet they extend the consequences to this day. He sees no reason why the consequences may not as well extend to a future state, provided the description cor-

responds with the description of that state, in other portions of the divine testimony.

New Pope.—By the late arrival from London, we learn that Cardinal Della Genga has been elected Pope, and has taken the title of Leo XII.—*C. Reg.*

Black River Branch of the Western Association.—The annual meeting of this Association was held Oct. 8th and 9th, at Ellisburgh, N.Y. The brethren who took a part in the public performances were, Brs. Cornelius G. Parsons, Warren Skinner, Abner Wood, Benjamin Hickox, Calvin Morton, Stephen R. Smith, John French, and Pitt Morse. Br. Abner Wood received a letter of fellowship to preach the gospel. The Societies in Richland and Antwerp, and "The first Universalist Church and Society in Sackets Harbor," were received into fellowship. The next meeting of this Association is to be at Brownville, on the fourth Wednesday and Thursday in June, 1824.

Genesee Branch of the Western Association.—The meeting of this body was held this year at Pittsford, Monroe Co. N. Y. September 23, and is adjourned to meet at Pembroke, the 3d Wednesday and Thursday in September, 1824. They received into fellowship "The first Universalist Society in the village of Buffalo," and "The first Society of Restoration Universalists of the town of Alexander." Br. J. Holiday received a letter of fellowship, and Brs. J. S. Thomson and L. S. Everitt were ordained.

Questions from a Roman Catholic, we calculate to attend to in our next.

OBITUARY.

Died, in Rutland, October 3, Mr. DANIEL CHAPMAN.

At Reading, October 11, Mr. PAUL FLETCHER, aged 48.

At Weare, N. H. Mr. JOHN PRIEST, aged 35. He has left an amiable wife, and children, ever dear to parents, to lament their loss. He cultivated the confidence and affection of

his acquaintances by a well ordered life and virtuous example. The distressed ever found in him a friend in time of need. *Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.*

At Plymouth, Oct. 14, Mrs. PHEBE BRIGGS, wife of Mr. John Briggs, in the 41st year of her age. She left an infant child who survived her till the 30th; when it was called to follow its departed parent.

Behold the scene, a mother dies !
How calmly sinks her soul to rest !
"How mildly beam her closing eyes !
"How gently heaves th' expiring breast !

"So fades a summer cloud away ;
"So sinks the gale when storms are o'er ;
"So gently shuts the eye of day ;
"So dies the wave along the shore.

"A holy quiet reigns around ;
"A calm which nothing can destroy ;
"Nought can disturb that peace profound,
"Which such unfetter'd souls enjoy."

Hope in the Lord my soul befriends,
While pressing on t' obey his call ;
Farewell, my husband, children, friends,
My infant babe,—I leave you all.

"Farewell, conflicting hopes and fears,
"Where lights and shades alternate dwell ;
"How bright th' unchanging morn appears ;
"Farewell, inconstant world, farewell."

At Reading, November 11, CHARLES ESTY, son of James Clark Esty, aged 1 year, wanting three days.

Death like a tyrant preys on all ;
Spare age nor youth, nor great nor small ;
The aged saint, and smiling babe
Are both his humble subjects made.
Yet since our Lord his vict'ry won,
And succors Adam's ev'ry son,
We would not weep with fell despair,
Who are the subjects of his care ;
But trusting in his righteousness,
Would yield him all that we possess ;
Since nought of which we feel bereft,
Is ours, but his most precious gift.

CHRISTIAN REPOSITORY.

No. 5.

FEBRUARY, 1824.

Vol. IV.

SERMON NO. XIV.

2 Tim. iii. 4. *Lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God.*

The desire of happiness is common to all sentient beings. The pursuit of happiness, which is prompted by desire, is as natural to us, as any conceivable act of body or mind. The principle which actuates, and the causes which impel us to seek this object are the same in all men; and the only supposable difference that can exist in the circumstances of men, in relation to this subject, arises, not from a difference in the general motive to action, but from the various and opposite courses that are taken to secure the object of their pursuit.

The moral system embraces maxims, and lays down rules, in reference to this article, at once clear, definite and influential. These maxims assert, that nothing is substantially and permanently good, and of course, nothing is truly pleasurable, that does not more affect the mind than the body. The principles advanced as the foundation of all virtue and felicity, lead to the conclusion, that there can be but two general sources from which any can expect to derive the satisfaction they so earnestly desire; the one yielding the pleasures that are merely corporeal or sensual, and which the lowest orders of being participate as well as man; the other mental, spiritual, and divine, which none can enjoy but such as were originally formed with the susceptibility of the good which they impart, and which none can receive except their minds are disposed for the blessing. Christianity admits of the existence of a supposed or spurious good in every vain and worthless object that the world affords; but it makes real pleasure and genuine happiness to consist in the love of God and a conformity to his character,

The distinction, therefore, between the two classes of persons, as respects their apprehensions, their men feelings, and their real condition, is as great as that which exists between the objects which they respectively pursue and attain. There can be but two classes in the world, who are properly distinguished in the text, "lovers of pleasure and lovers of God."

The preceding observations, arising as they do from the connexion of the words before us, indicate the doctrine, which specially claims our attention, which is, that the love of pleasure and the love of God are distinct and opposite exercises of the mind: we may be actively employed in the one, while we remain unaffected, uninfluenced by the other.

There can hardly be a greater error than that which is detected and exposed in the text. If a man supposes, that he is the friend of God merely because he is susceptible of pleasure, or inclined to seek his own felicity, he is grossly deceived; and what is worse, such impressions constitute the very essence of self-deception. By this the scriptures mean "thinking of ourselves above what we ought to think," or concluding that our moral condition is much better than it really is. It is as much the business of religion to detect error as to exhibit truth, and the first will in most cases, be found necessary to the last. You cannot easily set men in a right course, till you draw them off from the wrong; and to do this, you must not only expose the error of their way, but sometimes point out the cause of it. It cannot be any man's interest to wish to labor under self-deception. The interest of all men lies in knowing the truth, whether in reference to God or themselves.

If we grant what has been asserted, that all intelligent beings love their own good, and seek their own felicity, in what, it may be asked, consists the mighty difference between man and man? What constitutes the great distinction that we are laboring to maintain? We have already admitted, that in the constitution of their being there is no difference; all are actuated by

the same general principle and impelled to the pursuit of certain objects by the same common motive. But between the objects pursued there is, or may be conceived, a very great difference, and from this will arise as great a difference in the consequences, resulting from the attainment of the several objects of regard. Take the distinction as expressed in the text. One man is a lover of pleasure; no matter in what he makes it to consist, whether in one or in all the gaudy and fallacious objects which attract human admiration, for he will be as well, and perhaps better satisfied with one than the whole; but when he has attained what he sought, he will be still far from felicity, he will not be able to survey his prize with complacency; and his condition may resemble Alexander's, when, having conquered the world, he sat down and wept, that there was not another world to conquer. Another man shall seek the good that cometh from God only; he shall seek it in virtue, in purity and holiness; and admitting his success, his satisfaction, his joy, his complacency will be immense. His spirit will have drank at the fountain-head of transcendent delight. He will look no further for an object to fill his desires; and this will be the language of his heart, "Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth, that I desire beside thee." Such is the difference between the effects of the love of pleasure, and those resulting from the love of God.

But the subject requires, that we consider and define the love of pleasure still more particularly, having for our object to show wherein man exceeds the other orders of creatures that exist in the same state. Is man a being, created with a strong passion for the pleasures of sense only, and does he seek the gratification of this passion instinctively, without spending a single care upon objects of a more refined and elevated character? Then, indeed, I can see nothing in our species, which gives it a claim to a higher rank, than that assigned to the lowest orders of the animal creation. It will be seen, that independently of the

Christian revelation, the soul of man is its own witness, that it was formed to receive and enjoy higher pleasures than those of sense; and this species of testimony cannot be discredited, as it assumes nothing, and only shows from what the mind can do and enjoy, what it was designed by its author to perform and receive as its highest good. All men are willing to grant the capacity of the soul, its susceptibility of fine impressions, its power of reflection, its ability to philosophize, to refer effects to their proper causes, and to trace the laws of the visible universe through their various operations. Now when all this is cheerfully granted, may we not very properly inquire, why man possesses these powers? May we not ask, if these endowments, which distinguish man from the brutal creation, are given him only as the means of a pleasant exercise of mind? Are they of use, merely to inform us of certain laws of nature, operating to certain definite ends, while those laws have no Divine Author, who controls, and can suspend them at pleasure? Or, admitting that the human mind is capable of apprehending the existence of an all-wise and Almighty Being, deriving its evidence of his existence from "the things which are made," are we led to this result, only to discover, that infinite wisdom is employed in framing schemes, detrimental to human welfare, and omnipotence engaged in the production of eternal wretchedness? To all such questions, reason and common sense imperiously demand a decided negative. We disclaim such results as casting vile indignity upon man, and derogating from the honor of his Creator. There is no passion, no power, no capacity of the human soul, which is given for its own sake, to be employed a little while in the production of a transient, short-lived pleasure; but every attribute of the mind is bestowed, to be put in exercise, subordinately, and in subservience to its supreme good. We are formed for rational pleasure, that we may gratefully acknowledge him, who has given us the power of enjoyment; we study nature, that we

may know its Divine Author; the knowledge of God is desirable only, as it leads us to reverence, trust and love him; and our reverence, confidence, and love, are useful only as they are the inlets of pure, substantial, and permanent felicity.

Admitting the truth of these observations, we perceive the conclusions to which they evidently lead. The love of pleasure, and the enjoyment derived from earthly and sensual objects form not the points of distinction between man and other orders of beings. Pleasure may be courted and pursued, as the chief, the supreme good, and apparently without a single reflection, that we are capable of a good, more pure, satisfactory, and durable. We may cheat ourselves into the belief, that to seek happiness, even without regard to the means of attaining it, is true wisdom; that the love of happiness is nearly allied to the love of Deity, and that God is so pleased with promoting our felicity, that he is as indifferent as ourselves about the means by which it is procured. These are dangerous errors, detected and discountenanced by the text, which distinguishes between the love of pleasure and the love of God: as the one elevates us not above the inferior ranks of creatures, while the other, as a habit of the soul, acquired by the exertion of powers peculiarly adapted to this end, is a sublime attainment, resembling man to the great Author of his existence.

The desire, inherent in the moral and natural constitution of man, to arrive at happiness, was doubtless designed by him who gave it, for a great and benevolent purpose, as without it man could never be the recipient of any good, neither in the present, nor in a future state. The design of heaven in the implantation of this desire will, at one time or another, be fully accomplished. But such is the imperfection of our nature, and such the influence of error upon the human mind, that the best things may be grossly perverted, and that which was intended as the source of good, may become the source of evil. The error in this

case, consists not in the exercise of the desire, but in fixing it upon objects which are incapable of satisfying it; and further, in presuming to assure ourselves of felicity in a way, which God has not appointed, or, what is the same thing, in a way incompatible with the dignity of man, and the constitution of his moral nature. These errors are related. They can scarcely be dissociated, yet the last that I have mentioned requires the more particular notice, as an exemplification of its influence, will contribute to enforce the practical sentiments contained in the text.

The distinction between the love of pleasure and the love of God is obvious from these considerations; that the most abandoned transgressor has the former, while the man of virtue alone possesses the latter; and that the love of God is expressed entirely by a moral conformity to the divine requisitions. In determining moral character, and in addressing ourselves to the minds of men, with a view to their improvement, these considerations should be allowed their full weight and influence. When I am told that I must love God, and come into submission to his will, it is of the highest consequence, that he who addresses me upon this subject, should affix clear and definite ideas to the terms he uses, as otherwise, he may lead me to confound things which have no necessary relation. If to love God be nothing more than to love my own gratification; if to submit to the divine will be merely to be willing to be happy; and if to seek God be to seek what I esteem my best good, I need no persuasion, no pathetic addresses, no appeals to my reason to produce a compliance; the work is already accomplished. In this view of the subject, there would not be a man on earth, who did not seek God, and submit to him, and love him with all his heart. But if this theory be correct, the gospel is a most useless and inconsistent system, and all its commands, precepts and invitations are a dead letter. I offer these observations, because I am apprehensive that these ideas are frequently expressed in much too gen-

eral a way, and without the necessary distinctions. We talk of a submission to the will of God, and you never saw a man who wished to resist his will, when it coincided exactly with his own. We discourse of the promised and expected fruition of another world; but our language is often too general and indistinct. The question is, what constitutes the happiness of another life? In answer, we say, it consists in the opposite of that which produces the infelicity of the present life. This is true, by principles of analogy. And what produces the infelicity of this life? Sin is the great cause of it. Now, you will find no man, but what is willing to be saved from the inconveniences and troubles that attend him here; and when you speak of a future world, most persons seem to look forward with a kind of indistinct perception of joys in reversion, but of what they will consist they have no particular idea. Tell them, that salvation in this or the future life must consist in renouncing and detesting all unrighteousness, and in conforming to true holiness; and in many cases, this proposition would break up the association of crude ideas which many have formed, and probably you would find that they are directly opposed to the only scheme upon which salvation is practicable. They are willing to be happy, but the plan and the means do not comport with their standard. We discourse much of love to Deity. But in what does this consist? How do we define it? We say that "we love him because he first loved us." This is true; but it does not embrace all that belongs to the subject. How shall it be determined whether or not, we comply with the first and great command? There is but one criterion. "This is the love of God, that ye keep his commandment." If we fall short, upon trial by this standard, we deceive ourselves if we suppose that "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts." We are indeed "lovers of pleasures, but not lovers of God."

These remarks are founded upon principles the most simple, and facts the most common and familiar.

It is not in our nature to love what is or appears to be directly contrary to our feelings, habits, and practices; nor is this possible while the contrariety continues. A man, therefore, is no more a lover of God, while in a state of practical nonconformity to his requirements, than he is of any other object, between which and himself, the greatest contrariety exists.

In advancing these statements, I have endeavored, with as much perspicuity and plainness as possible, to do a degree of justice to a subject, which certainly deserves the attention of all Christians. We may persuade ourselves that we have adopted a system of doctrine, free from most of the errors which attach to others, and in this we may be right. But it should be remembered, that no system exempts us entirely from the influence of error; and that the best may be perverted, and its beneficial tendency counteracted. This should awaken our care and circumspection, and teach us, "if we think we stand, to take heed lest we fall."

The subject shows us the nature and design of the gospel, and describes the character of the work which it is calculated to effect. We hear much of the necessity of becoming new creatures, and this doctrine is enforced in a manner so general and indistinct, that if we can draw any conclusion respecting it, it must be, that our whole nature must undergo a radical change, and the principles incorporated into the moral system, as it now is, be completely subverted. Upon the plan indicated in the preceding remarks, we see no need of this. We suppose that God addresses man as he is; that he speaks to our affections, our desires, our hopes and our love of happiness; and that the gospel avails itself of the common laws of the mind to operate its effects. We believe that the gospel is designed to undeceive us with respect to the objects of our regard, and to place before us those which are more suitable to the dignity of our nature, and better calculated to engage and fix our love and admiration. We have labored to exemplify the important truth, that the only sure way of removing the evil that exists in the mind,

is to apply the remedy to the part most seriously affected. If we have ever been or are now deceived with the persuasion, that the love of pleasure bears any analogy to the love of Deity, let us correct the error, by assuring ourselves, that this is no further the case, than as we find the sum of all satisfaction in the contemplation and imitation of him with whom no other object should ever come in competition. We repeat it, the love of pleasure, the love of our own gratification, a regard to our own felicity, aside from this consideration, is not the love of God.

GENERAL EPISTLE.

[Concluded from page 190.]

During our session, our hearts were made glad by the joyful intelligence, received from every direction, of the increase of believers, the formation of societies and associations, the organization of churches, the addition of laborers to the ministry, and the unexampled prosperity of Zion in the rapid advancement of gospel truth. The cause of universal benevolence, grace, and salvation, is generally flourishing throughout our happy country; particularly in Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode-Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and various parts of the state of New-York. At this anniversary session, one young brother was set apart to the work of the ministry of reconciliation, by the solemnity of ordination; and three others received into fellowship as ministers of the divine word: all of whom we humbly trust have been endowed from above to testify the gospel of the never-failing grace of God—and we fervently invoke on them the eternal benedictions of heaven, for their faithfulness and success in the promotion of peace on earth and good will amongst men, and in all the labors of the moral vineyard of our God. The services of the sanctuary were solemn, powerful, instructive, and delightful. The devout worship of the temple was enlivened by the masterly perform-

ance of a large choir of singers, who tuned every heart to the influence of devotion, while thronging multitudes and listening thousands inhaled the pure spirit of impartial benevolence, and with joy unspeakable and full of glory, received the divine energy of eternal and infinite love. From the record of Heaven's gracious will, and the Testament of eternal mercy, we learned that God is the ever-living fountain of goodness, the everlasting Benefactor of all his creatures, and that no created being can prevail against us. There we contemplated the vast importance of the pure inspiration of Heaven, uncontaminated by the senseless traditions of a superstitious world, and undiluted by the labors of imperfect men.—There we feasted on the bread of God which giveth spiritual and eternal life to a sinful, famishing world. There we received the strong injunction of perpetual continuance in the doctrine of divine life and eternal truth. The heavens showered down righteousness and grace—our minds were instructed—our souls edified—our hearts gladdened—our spirits rejoiced—the silken cord of divine love entwined every heart—the accents of mercy breathed in every breeze—creation smiled in the boundless bounty of God—and the swelling tide of gratitude and heart-felt joy ascended to the holy habitation of Divinity.

The believers in the fulfilment of the divine promise that all nations, all families, and all kindreds of the earth shall be blessed with justification through faith in Christ, the spiritual head of every man and the heir of all things, have abundant reason to rejoice in all the dispensations of our heavenly Father, and to let their light shine before men that others beholding their good works may glorify their Father in heaven. Brethren, while you behold the light of the Sun of righteousness beaming from on high in all the splendor of unclouded day, and chasing darkness from the human mind—while you are surrounded with numberless blessings of the all-bountiful Providence of God, and enjoy the privileges of social existence—

While you feel the delightful, the life-giving influence of Almighty goodness and grace—while, by an eye of faith, you witness the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ—while you contemplate the nameless felicities of immortality and endless life—can you suppress the rising emotions of love to the God of your salvation? Can you fail to cherish the spirit of universal philanthropy—to promote the peace and good order of society—to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly—and to evince by well ordered lives and conversation that you have been taught of God? May the peace of God that passeth all understanding be ever yours.

Brethren in the ministry of universal reconciliation, Suffer the word of exhortation from one who would ever joyfully share with you the instructions of divine wisdom, and would humbly solicit the counsel of age and experience in the reciprocal exercise of fraternal affection, and the faithful performance of christian duty. The whitened fields of the Redeemer's harvest extend in boundless prospect. The chryselline streams of the river of life in gentle currents flow—The spirit of inquiry is abroad in the earth, and all eyes are directed to the mountain of Zion to receive the blessing of those whose feet are shod with the preparation of the gospel of divine peace, who bring good tidings, who publish salvation, who proclaim the universally triumphant reign of Jehovah, and pronounce the words of eternal life. If you would finish your course with joy to testify the everlasting gospel of the impartial grace of God, it is highly important that you give yourselves wholly to these things that your profiting may appear to all—that you hold frequent, sweet communion with your God—that you teach by precept as well as by example—that you preserve the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace—that you be instant in season and out of season in the arduous labors of your vocation—and that you ever keep in view the bright example of our Lord and Master, whose soul was compassion, whose life was purity, whose word was truth,

and whose governing principle was, thy *will*, O God, be done! Remember that it is required of stewards that a man be found faithful. Remember that the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient in meekness, instructing those who oppose themselves. Remember that our bond of union is not any particular speculative *opinion*, but it is *charity* out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience and of faith unfeigned. Preserve inviolable this bond of perfectness. Your duty is to instruct the ignorant, reform the vicious, console the afflicted, confirm the wavering, uphold the weak, relieve the oppressed, break the bread of life, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine; and let humility, sincerity, forbearance and charity, adorn your lives, while instrumentally directing the triumphant march of the human mind to the glorious Temple of divine wisdom and eternal truth. Above all things, be entreated to remember your entire dependence on *Him* at whose mandate all worlds were formed—all beings created, and all creation crowned with light and glory.

All herein addressed, are most affectionately commended to the paternal care and tender mercy of a *God of underived, immutable, unbounded, and endless love!*—And may all people respond, Amen.

Per order,

PITT MORSE.

From the Universalist Magazine.

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSALISTS.

At their annual meeting, the Southern Association of Universalists convened at the house of Col. Sullivan Sumner, of Milford, Mass. Dec. 9th, 1823.

Br. Thomas Whittemore opened the meeting of the Council by prayer.

Chose Br. Richard Carrique, *Moderator*.

Br. Jacob Frieze, *Clerk*.

Chose Brs. Edward Turner, Barzillai Streeter, and Joshua Flagg, a Committee to receive requests for Letters of Fel-

lowship and Ordination. Adjourned to Wednesday morning, half past eight o'clock. Prayer by Br. T. G. Farnsworth.

Wednesday morning, met according to adjournment. Br. H. Ballou 2d. opened by prayer.

The Committee appointed at the session of this Association, in June last, to labor with the Authors of the "Appeal and Declaration," reported, that they had attended to that duty, but without effect.—Voted to accept said Report, and to discharge the Committee from further service.

Order of Public Service on Wednesday Morning.

Introductory prayer, Br. C. Hudson.

Sermon by Br. B. Streeter, from 2 Tim. i. 10. "Who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."

Concluding prayer by Br. B. Whittemore.

Afternoon Service.

Introductory prayer by Br. David Pickering.

Sermon by Br. Edward Turner—Text, 1 Cor. ii. 14. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned."

Concluding prayer by Br. H. Ballou 2d.

In Council, after divine service,—Chose Brs. Hosea Ballou, David Pickering, Jacob Frieze, Richard Carrique, and Hosea Ballou 2d. a Committee to draft proposals of reconciliation between those brethren, who are the Authors of the "Appeal and Declaration," and this Association. Adjourned to Thursday morning, at half past eight o'clock.

Br. Adin Ballou closed by prayer.

Thursday morning met according to adjournment.

Prayer by Br. Edward Turner.

The Committee appointed, last evening, presented the following proposals, which were accepted by the Association. Here follows:—

Whereas certain publications, called an Appeal to the Public and a Declaration to the World, have been construed to indicate a disfellowship, as expressed in a Resolve of the Southern Association, the undersigned authors of the Declaration, being possessed of a fervent desire to restore the happy union and fellowship of our religious order, and to enjoy ourselves, desire to remove all difficulties above noted, by certifying that we do most cordially acknowledge and accept as christian ministers, and brethren, such as

differ from us on the subjects of doctrine, maintained in the above named publications. And we receive and consider the acceptance of this proposal by the Association, as an assurance on their part, that they reciprocate the sentiments and feelings of christian fellowship above mentioned.

EDWARD TURNER.

BARZILLAI STREETER.

CHARLES HUDSON.

Voted, the same is fully satisfactory to this Association, in relation to the signers thereof, and that this body reciprocate the christian feeling and fellowship, therein expressed.

Order of services on Thursday morning.

Introductory prayer by T. G. Farnsworth.

Sermon by Br. D. Pickering, from Isaiah liii. 1. "Who hath believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?"

Concluding prayer by Br. A. Ballou.

In the afternoon, Br. Adin Ballou was solemnly set apart to the work of the gospel ministry by ordination.

Order of Services.

Introductory prayer by Br. R. L. Killam.

Sermon by Br. H. Ballou,—text, 2 Tim. iv. 2. "Preach the word, be instant, in season, out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine."

Consecrating prayer by Br. J. Flagg.

Charge and delivery of the Scriptures, by Br. R. Carrique.

Right hand of Fellowship by Br. H. Ballou 2d.

Concluding prayer by Br. C. Hudson.

Granted Letters of Fellowship to Brs. Eliphalet Case, Jr. and Calvin Gardner.

Adjourned to meet again at the First Universalist Meeting House in Attleborough, Mass. on the 2d Wednesday and Thursday in June next.

Br. H. Ballou closed the Session by solemn and devout prayer.

RICHARD CARRIQUE, *Moderator.*
JACOB FRIEZE, *Clerk.*

The following extract from the solemn address of the eminently pious and candid Dr. WATTS, which was made to the great and ever-blessed God, on a review of what he had written in the Trinitarian controversy, is earnestly recommended to the serious perusal of the reader. The address was prefixed by Dr. Watts to pieces he had written in this controversy, which his executors did not judge necessary to publish.—Some of the sentiments which it contains, are different from those he entertained at an earlier period of life.

D. M.

ADDRESS.

Righteous art thou, O Lord, when I plead with thee ; yet I may talk with thee concerning thy judgments. Permit me, O my God and Father, to plead with thee concerning the revelations of thy nature and thy grace, which are made in thy gospel. And let me do it with all that humble reverence, and that holy awe, of thy Majesty, which becomes a creature in the presence of his God.

Hast thou not, O Lord God Almighty, hast thou not transacted thy divine and important affairs among men by thy Son Jesus Christ, and by thy holy spirit ? and hast thou not ordained that men should transact their highest and most momentous concerns with thee, by thy Son and by thy spirit ? Must I not know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ thy Son, whom thou hast sent, that I may fulfil all my respective duties towards thyself and thy Son, in hope of eternal life ? Hath not thy Son himself, appealed to thee in his last prayer, that eternal life depends on this knowledge ? And since thou hast made so much use of thy holy spirit in our religion, must I not have some knowledge of this thy spirit also, that I may pay thee all these honors thou requirest from this divine revelation ?

Hast thou not ascribed divine names, and titles, and characters to thy Son and thy holy spirit in thy word ? And yet art not thou, and thou alone, the true God ?

Holy Father, thou knowest how firmly I believe with all my soul, whatsoever thou hast plainly written and revealed in thy word. I believe thee to be the only true God, the supreme of beings, self-sufficient for thine own existence, and for all thy infinite affairs and transactions among creatures. I believe thy Son Jesus Christ to be all-sufficient for the glorious work of mediation between God and man, to which thou hast appointed him to fulfil the blessed works for which thou hast exalted him, and to govern and judge the world in thine appointed time.

I believe also thy blessed Spirit hath almighty power and influence to do all thy will, to instruct men effectually in divine truths, to change the hearts of fallen mankind from sin to holiness, to carry on thy work of illumination, sanctification, and consolation on the souls of all thy children, and to bring them safe to the heavenly world. I yield myself up joyfully and thankfully to this method of thy salvation, as it is revealed in the gospel. But I acknowledge my darkness still. I want to have this wonderful doctrine of the all-sufficiency of thy Son and thy Spirit, for these divine works, made a little plainer. Is it a vain and sinful curiosity to desire to have this article set in such a light, as may not diminish the eternal glory of the unity of the true God, nor of the supremacy of thee, the Father of all?

Hadst thou informed me, gracious Father, in any place of thy word, that this divine doctrine is not to be understood by men, and yet they were required to believe it, I would have subdued all my curiosity to faith, and submitted my wandering and doubtful imaginations, as far as it was possible, to the holy and wise determinations of thy word. But I cannot find thou hast any where forbid me to understand it or to make these inquiries. My conscience is the best natural light thou hast put within me, and since thou hast given me the scriptures, my own conscience bids me to search the scriptures, to find out truth and eternal life. It bids me try all things, and hold fast

that which is good. And thy own word by the same expressions, encourages this holy practice. I have, therefore, been long searching into this divine doctrine, that I may pay thee due honor with understanding. Surely I ought to know the God whom I worship, whether he be one pure and simple being, or whether thou art a three fold Deity, consisting of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Dear and blessed God, hadst thou been pleased, in any one plain scripture, to have informed me which of the different opinions about the holy Trinity, among the contending parties of christians, had been true, thou knowest with how much zeal, satisfaction and joy, my unbiassed heart would have opened itself to receive and embrace the divine discovery. Hadst thou told me plainly, in one single text, that the Father, Son and holy Spirit, are three real distinct persons in thy divine nature, I had never suffered myself to be bewildered in so many doubts, nor embarrassed with so many strong fears of assenting to the mere inventions of men, instead of divine doctrine; but I should have humbly and immediately accepted thy words, so far as it was possible for me to understand them as the only rule of my faith. Or, hadst thou been pleased to express and include this proposition in the several scattered parts of thy book, from whence my reason and conscience might with ease find out, and with certainty infer this doctrine, I should have joyfully employed all my reasoning powers, with their utmost skill and activity, to have found out this inference, and ingrafted it into my soul. But how can such weak creatures (men) ever take in so strange, so difficult, and so abstruse a doctrine as this, in the explication and defence whereof, multitudes of men, even men of learning and piety, have lost themselves in infinite subtleties of dispute, and endless mazes of darkness?

Thou art witness, O my God, with what diligence, with what constancy and care, I have read and searched thy holy word, how early and late, by night and by

day, I have been making these inquiries. How fervently have I been seeking thee on my bended knees, and directing my humble addresses to thee, to enlighten my darkness, and to shew me the meaning of thy word, that I may learn what I must believe, and what I must practise with regard to this doctrine, in order to please thee, and obtain eternal life.

I humbly call thee to witness, O my God, what a holy jealousy I ever wear about my heart, lest I should do the slightest dishonor to thy supreme Majesty, in any of my inquiries or determinations. Thou seest what a religious fear, and what a tender solicitude I maintain on my soul, lest I should think or speak any thing to diminish the grandeurs and honors of thy Son Jesus, my dear mediator, to whom I owe my everlasting hopes. Thou knowest how much afraid I am of speaking one word, which may be construed into a neglect of thy blessed Spirit. Guard all the motions of my mind, O almighty God, against every thing that borders upon these dangers. Forbid my thoughts to indulge, and forbid my pen to write one word, that should sink those grand ideas which belong to thyself, or to thy Son, or thy holy Spirit. Forbid it, O my God, that ever I should be so unhappy as to unglorify my Father, my Savior, or my Sanctifier, in any of my sentiments or expressions concerning them.

Blessed and faithful God, am I not truly sensible of my own darkness and weakness, my dangerous prejudices on every side, and my utter insufficiency for my own conduct? Wilt thou leave such a poor creature bewildered among a thousand perplexities, which are raised by various opinions and contrivances of men to explain thy divine truth?

Help me, heavenly Father, for I am quite tired and weary of these human explainings, so various and uncertain. When wilt thou explain it to me thyself, O my God, by the secret and certain dictates of thy Spirit, according to the intimations of thy word? nor let any pride of reason, nor any affectation of novelty, nor any criminal bias whatsoever, turn my heart aside

from harkening to these divine dictates of thy word, and thy Spirit. Suffer not any of my native corruptions, nor the vanity of my imaginations to cast a mist over my eyes, while I am searching after the knowledge of thy mind and will, for my eternal salvation.

I entreat, O most merciful Father, that thou wilt not suffer the remnant of my short life to be wasted in such endless wanderings, in quest of thee or thy Son Jesus, as a great part of my days have been; but let my sincere endeavors to know thee, in all the ways whereby thou hast discovered thyself in thy word, be crowned with such success, that my soul being established in every needful truth by thy holy Spirit, I may spend my remaining life according to the rules of thy gospel, and may with all the holy and happy creation ascribe glory and honor, wisdom and power to thee, who sittest upon the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever.

RELIGIOUS CONFERENCE BETWEEN A CONGREGATION-
ALIST AND A UNIVERSALIST.

Concluded from page 176.

Some conversation then ensued upon the parable of the ten virgins. Mr. K. read the parable and explained; he understood the wise virgins to represent the real disciples of Christ; the foolish those who were only nominal professors, who only had the appearance of Christians; but were never in possession of the oil of divine grace, for they took no oil in their lamps. From this opinion Mr. B. dissented. By the kingdom of heaven he understood the gospel, or gospel dispensation, which had commenced. He understood that this kingdom or the gospel was likened unto ten virgins with much propriety, because they were a fit emblem to represent purity. He contended that all had oil in their lamps, the foolish as well as the wise, otherwise there would be no propriety in the phrase, "our lamps have gone out"—that their lamps could

never have gone out unless they had first been lighted—that they could never have been lighted without oil—that he, Mr. K. mistook with regard to the reading of the passage, when he said the foolish took no oil in their lamps; but that it was true that they took no oil in their vessels, while the wise did. He presumed the lamp, oil, and vessel, were the same in those, as in modern days. He used a lamp, and had attached to it what was called a lamp-waiver, which contained the oil, with which to replenish the lamp when it was about to go out for want of oil. It was plain to every one, that a lamp must go out unless it was replenished with oil; he considered the foolish virgins a fit emblem to represent those who had or should fall away from their first love, as did most of the churches who were accused in the book of Revelation by the spirit of inspiration; that this must inevitably overthrow the darling doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints, when connected with the doctrine of endless misery.

Question by Mr. K.—How do you get along with the account our Savior gave of the rich man and Lazarus?

The rich man died and went to hell, while Lazarus was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom. Mr. B. considered it to be a parable, which like the other parables of our Savior, was connected with, and related to events which did take place at the time Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans. Mr. K. denied that it was a parable, he said that the manner in which it was introduced was enough to convince any one that it was not a parable, for our Savior said there *was* a certain rich man, &c. and that he (Jesus) *was* where in the scriptures declared a thing to be that was not. He considered it to be a plain piece of history, for there *was* a certain rich man, &c. and there *was* a beggar, &c.

Mr. B. admitted it (for the sake of the argument) to be a plain piece of history, agreeable to Mr. K's statement. Of course, the man of whom our Savior

spoke, must have lived in the days of Abraham in his life-time must have died, been buried, went to hell, and after he was dead, must have been capable of speaking, feeling, and seeing ; and Abraham too, must have been his father. The poor man also must have lived at the same period of time. He too must have died, and by literal celestial angels, his dead body must have been carried and lodged in Abraham's literal bosom. Mr. K. said that Mr. B. held that a dead man could lift up his eyes, speak, &c. which was a manifest impossibility ; what an inconsistent idea !! Mr. B. in answer replied, that it was not he that held to such inconsistencies ; but that he was only drawing the inevitable conclusions from Mr. K's statement, which he only admitted for the sake of argument. He differed from Mr. K. in opinion, as would appear from his statement made in the outset that it was a parable, &c. Mr. K. remarked, that the rich man was tormented in the flames of hell, in so much that he called to Abraham to send Lazarus that he might dip the tip of his finger in water, that he might cool his tongue, for he was tormented in this flame, (meaning the flames of hell.) He considered Mark, 9th chapter, from 43d verse to the end, as corroborative testimony of the idea just advanced. "If thy hand, thy foot, or thine eye, offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee, for it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, than having two feet, two hands, or two eyes, to be cast into hell-fire ; where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." He wished to know Mr. B's views of this scripture, which he considered as conclusive testimony to prove the doctrine of endless misery, for the fire into which they were to be cast, was hell-fire ; "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Mr. B. replied, that the word rendered hell-fire in the passage, was a translation from Gehenna to the Greek. He observed that it was taken from the Hebrew *Ge Hinnom*, that is, *the valley of Hinnom*, which is a place where the idolatrous Jews sacrificed their children to Moloch (a heathen god)

situated eastward of Jerusalem. It was also called **Tophet**, a burial place, or place of burning, being by **Josiah**, rendered filthy, to stop the idolatrous worship of the Jews.

Multitudes also of the Jews were here buried, who were slain, when Jerusalem was taken by the Chaldeans—that afterwards it became the common receptacle of the dead, of carcases, garbage, and filth, for the destruction of which, a fire was kept continually burning. He stated farther, that he considered that our Savior, when he spoke of hell-fire, always had allusion to those sacrifices, made to **Moloch**; because, in all places, where we read of hell-fire, the word for hell is **Gehenna**. These sacrifices were contrary to the just commands of God, and for this reason he pronounced a judgement upon the place. See Jer. vii. 32, 33.—“Therefore behold the days come, saith the Lord, that it no more shall be called **Tophet**, nor the Valley of the son of **Hinnom**, but the Valley of slaughter, for they shall bury in **Tophet** till there be no place. And the carcases of the people shall be meat for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth; and none shall fray them away.” He considered also that **Isaiah** had allusion to the same place in the last verse of his prophecy. “And they shall go forth and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.”

From the Columbian Star.

A REVEREND GAMBLER.

Dr. Scott.—“This eminent clergyman, in the former part of his life, was exceedingly fond of cards. Ill success, however, on one occasion, checked his propensity to gaming, and he lost all relish for the diversion. After he had assumed the clerical character, he never omitted worship in his family at the proper hours, and usually proposed it in his visits. He occasionally join-

ed after this in a *game of cards*, fearing that too great preciseness might prejudice his neighbors. He was of the opinion that there was *no harm in the practice*, tho it seemed a frivolous method of spending time. "I felt," says he, "that it was a very awkward transition to remove the card table, and introduce the Bible and family worship."

More than ten times the amount of money has been paid for this man's "Family Bible" in the United States than in Great Britain, in proportion to the wealth of the two countries. "But Scott left off gambling and other sins before he died," says one of his admirers.—Granted, but does it follow that his dull and expensive commentaries should exclude all other books from our shelves, merely because he was not quite so immoral as other English clergymen?

Some of our deluded countrymen have purchased this book, who could neither pay their debts nor provide food for their families.

A. B.

CHURCH ESTABLISHMENTS.

Most of the *government-churches* of Europe appear to us to be maintained—not for the purpose of making men wiser and better, and leading them the way to heaven—but to assist the temporal power to perpetuate that despotism to which the minds and bodies of men have been subject for so many ages. The church is held in requisition to support the government, and the various test-acts, inquisitions, &c. are so many state-engines, intended to keep the people in subjection to tyrants. The most aggravated abuses exist not only in catholic, but in protestant establishments. There is not perhaps, in all Europe, an established church so odious and oppressive as the episcopal establishment in Ireland. The population of Ireland is seven millions, of which 5,500,000 are catholics, about 1,000,000 are presbyterians, methodists and other dissenters, and less than half a million belong to the episcopal established church. The clergy who watch

over these 4 or 500,000 protestants of the establishment receive a tenth part of the produce of a country which feeds seven millions of people! The catholic and protestant dissenters, who comprise thirteen-fourteenths of all the inhabitants, are forced to yield up a tenth of the fruit of their toils to support a church from which they derive no benefit. Nor is this all—beside the tithe, one thirteenth part of all the land in the kingdom is in possession of the clergy of the established church. Here are bishops, who profess to be servants of the “meek and lowly” Jesus, who receive an annual income of 80 or 90,000 dollars. The whole annual revenue of the Episcopal clergy is calculated to exceed five millions of dollars, which is extorted from the most miserable poor people in Europe. The clergy commonly devolve the work of exacting the tithes upon others, who are called tithe-proctors; and these men, looking only to their own profit, levy the tithes with merciless rigor, regardless of the miseries they inflict. Many of the clergy do not reside in their benefices, but live in idleness and indulgence in England or France, and hire a poor curate for a trifling sum to perform the ministerial duties. In one parish, where the revenue was only 20 pounds a year, the incumbent hired a deputy to perform the duty for 30 shillings! but the latter had a good bargain, for there was no church in the district. There are many parishes where there are no churches, and yet tithes are rigorously collected; and there are some clergymen of the church of Ireland in rich livings who have not a single protestant parishioner. It is the tithes and rents that oppress the poor peasantry of Ireland, and it is these abuses against which they are forever breaking out in rebellion. The British government makes laws for Ireland, and to that government, rather than to the clergy, should be ascribed that system of oppression which spreads disaffection, poverty and wretchedness throughout the land.—The preceding facts are chiefly derived from the *Edinburgh Review*, and *Reed's Travels in Ireland*.

What cause for gratitude to heaven have we in the United States, that we live under a free government, and have no ecclesiastical establishment to domineer over us. Here we choose our own civil rulers and our own religious instructors. No teachers of religion are maintained, who do not perform the duties of their station, and whose conduct is not such as to meet the approbation of those that they instruct. The clergy of no other country are so virtuous and exemplary as those of the United States, including every denomination.—*Hampshire Gazette.*

QUESTIONS BY A ROMAN CATHOLIC TO A UNIVERSALIST, WITH ANSWERS.

1. Are you bound to answer in writing any proper question on the subject of religion?
2. Who was the first person, and in what year did he live, who first exercised supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the same manner as the present Pope Pius* the seventh?
3. If there is but one church, what are its essential and unalterable marks?
4. What and when was the first erroneous corrupt doctrine received by the church?
5. Is the Christian Church a body that is visible in whole or only in part? and if in part, how much is visible?
6. Will you tell me to what particular person or persons I must listen in order to comply with Church precepts?
7. What is schism? and will you name two persons, who are at this moment guilty of that sin?
8. Is salvation attainable in the Roman Catholic Church, and in conformity to the faith and morals she inculcates? if not, name the reason why?
9. Are any of the foregoing questions improper?

* When this question was written, the death of Pope Pius was not known in this country.

If so, name which of them, and give the reason why?

Answers to the foregoing Questions.

1. We as professors of the Christian system, deem it our duty and privilege to do whatever, we can rationally believe, is calculated to promote the interest of the Redeemer's cause, and the happiness of our fellow men. We therefore feel bound to answer in writing or otherwise, any proper question, whenever we have reason to hope, some good will result from our labor.

2. A direct answer to the second question must evidently rest solely upon historical testimony. It appears that our querist thought, that no such answer could be given; nor indeed do we think it essential to the cause of protestantism, that this question should be directly met. If we can make it appear that no person in the first age of the Christian Church, exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the manner the Popes of later ages have done, it cannot much affect the question between protestantism and popery, if we cannot tell in what person, nor at what time the improper or usurped power began. If we prove the difference between the ancient Church of Christ, and the modern of Rome, we prove the fact. To this point we are disposed to offer one argument, drawn from the words of our Savior in Matt. xxiii. 8, 9, 10, 11. "But be ye not called Rabbi; for one is your master even Christ, and *all ye are brethren*. And call no man your father on the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you, shall be your servant." These words appear utterly inconsistent to raising one disciple to a dignified office above the others; but it is well known, that the Catholic Church do not allow the Pope an equal on earth. He reigns supreme over all ecclesiastical dignitaries, within the confines of her power. Besides, the very official name of pope is that of *father*, a name expressly forbidden every disciple of Jesus by their divine Master.

But if we attempt to give the question a direct answer, history affords the following: "The disputes about preeminence that had so long subsisted between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, proceeded in this century (*the seventh*) to such violent lengths, as laid the foundations of that deplorable schism, which afterward separated the Greek and Latin churches. The most learned writers, and those who are most remarkable for their knowledge of antiquity, are generally agreed that Boniface III. engaged Phocas, that abominable tyrant, who waded to the imperial throne through the blood of the emperor Mauritius, to take from the bishop of Constantinople the title of *œcumenical* or *universal bishop*, and to confer it upon the Roman pontiff. They relate this however upon the sole authority of Baronius; for none of the ancient writers have mentioned it. If indeed we are to give credit to Anastasius and Paul Deacon, something like what we have now related was transacted by Phocas; for when the bishops of Constantinople maintained that their church was not only equal in dignity and authority to that of Rome, but also the head of all the christian churches, this tyrant opposed their pretensions, and granted the pre-eminence to the church of Rome; and thus was the papal supremacy first introduced."

Moshiem's His. Vol. I. page 452.

"Not merely in the administration of justice did the Roman pontiff invade the rights of civil government. In the year 606, the emperor Phocas, by a public decree, invested the Pope with the title of *universal bishop*, and clothed him with superior authority in all ecclesiastical concerns. Thus empowered, the servant became too mighty for the master. From this time the Pope claimed the right of nominating and investing bishops in all the churches in Europe, tho the claim was not immediately allowed in every kingdom."—*Bancroft's Sermons, page 127.*

3. We believe the essential tokens of the church of Christ are faith in him, and the exercise of that love

toward God and toward man, which is the fulfilling of the law. The term church, is, however, sometimes taken for all mankind, without reference to their moral character.

4. Corrupt doctrines began to be received as early as in the days of the Apostles. There were those that said the resurrection was already past, and overthrew the faith of some.

5. The Christian Church, which we consider an assembly of believers in Christ, is so far manifest as it exhibits the character and works of its divine Master, Jesus Christ.

6. We know of no particular person or persons, church, creed, or platform, that have arisen, or been drawn up, since the apostolic age, which we should receive as an infallible guide in precept or doctrine. The Bible contains our religion, and is our guide. The works of learned and pious men may be used as helps to interpret the scriptures, but not as infallible guides.

7. Schism is a word of Greek original. Hedericus explains it, *dissidium, dissensio, discordia; schisma, ruptio unionis in ecclesia*. It is a division in a church, not respecting a few articles in point of theory, but a division in affection, by which disturbances and tumults are occasioned. As we wish not to deal in personalities, we choose not to mention any particular persons, who are at this time guilty of this sin. We believe there may be such a thing as schism without acknowledging an infallible church.

8. We have no doubt but what a person may be a sincere Christian and belong to the Roman Catholic Church. How near they may approximate to an evangelical salvation, we pretend not to decide. We do not think, however, that any person will ever be plunged in unalterable misery because he is a Roman Catholic.

9. From the notice taken of the preceding questions, our querist has our views of them without any direct answer to this.

We know not how these answers may appear to him; but they are such as we offer him and the public in honesty and sincerity. Whatever may appear erroneous or improper in these answers, he is at liberty to notice in this work, should he think proper. We hope the day is too far spent to contend in bitterness on the subject of a religious and christian faith. To contend *earnestly* for the faith of the gospel may be commendable. For he that is in earnest, tho he may not always convince, will act according to the dictates of an upright and sincere conscience.



From the Gospel Herald.

NEWS FROM SCOTLAND.

We have received another epistle from our Br. Worrall, dated Glasgow, Oct. 11, 1823, from which we extract the following:

"We have received an epistle from a small church at Colerain, in the north of Ireland; of which we had not before heard. It is certain that liberal views of the Divine economy, and rational ideas of the Creator's purpose and design in redemption, are extending their mild and genial influence around us. May the Great Head of the Church prepare and send forth laborers into the gospel harvest, who may be powerfully successful in making inroads into the kingdom of darkness, instrumental in dissipating the gloom of darkness, and successful in counteracting the efforts of priestcraft.

"I admire the liberality and forbearance so long practised among American Universalists; and shall feel unspeakably rejoiced to know they continue united in sentiment upon the Rock of Ages, Christ Jesus, and preserve the unity of the spirit in bonds of heavenly peace. The duration of punishment we may consider a matter of minor importance. JEHOVAH afflicts not willingly, nor necessarily grieves the children of men. Not a stripe will be inflicted more than is required for the good of the chastened."

Our Br. Worrall for himself, and on behalf of our brethren in Glasgow, tenders grateful acknowledgements to those who have forwarded books, and "administered to the intellectual pleasure and gratification" of our distant Brethren.

MILTON ON HERESY.

From his "Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes."

But we shall not carry it thus. Another Greek apparition stands in our way, *Heresy* and *Heretic*; in like manner also railed at to the people, as in a tongue unknown. They should first interpret to them, that heresy, by what it signifies in that language, is no word of evil note—meaning only the choice or following of any opinion, good or bad, in religion, or any other learning; and thus, not only in heathen authors, but in the New Testament itself, without censure or blame; Acts xv. 5. "Certain of the heresy of the Pharisees which believed;" and xxvi. 5. "After the exactest heresy of our religion, I lived a Pharisee." In which sense presbyterian or independent may without reproach be called a heresy. Where it is mentioned with blame, it seems to differ little from schism; 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19. "I hear that there be schisms among you," &c. "for there must also heresies be among you." Tho some who write of heresy after their own heads, would make it far worse than schism; whereas, on the contrary, schism signifies division; and in the worst sense; heresy, choice only of one opinion before another, which may be without discord. In apostolic times therefore, ere the scripture was written, heresy was a doctrine maintained against the doctrine by them delivered; which in these times can be no otherwise defined than a doctrine maintained against the light, which we now only have of the scripture.

Seeing, therefore, that no man, no synod, no session of men, tho called the Church, can judge definitely the sense of scripture to another man's conscience,

which is well known to be a general maxim of the protestant religion, it follows plainly, that he who holds in religion that belief, or those opinions, which to his conscience and utmost understanding appear with most evidence or probability in the scripture, tho to others he seem erroneous, can no more be justly censured for a heretic than his censurers, who do but the same thing themselves, while they censure him for so doing. For ask them, or any protestant which hath most authority, the church or the scripture? They will answer, doubtless, that the scripture; and what hath most authority, that no doubt but they will confess is to be followed. He then, who to his best apprehension follows the scripture, tho against any point of doctrine by the whole church received, is not the heretic; but he who follows the church against his conscience and persuasion, grounded on the scripture.

To make this yet more undeniable, I shall only borrow a plain simile, the same which our own writers, when they would demonstrate plainest, that we rightly prefer the scripture before the church, use frequently against the papist in this manner. As the Samaritans believed Christ, first for the woman's word, but next, and much rather for his own, so we the scripture; first on the church's word, but afterwards and much more for its own, as the word of God; yea, the church itself we believe then for the scripture. The inference of itself follows. If by the protestant doctrine we believe the scripture, not for the church's saying, but for its own, as the word of God, then ought we to believe what in our conscience we apprehend the scripture to say, tho the visible church, with all her doctors, gain-say; and being taught to believe them only for the scripture, they who so do are not heretics, but the best protestants, and by their opinions, whatever they be, can hurt no protestant, whose rule is not to receive them but from the scripture; which to interpret convincingly to his own conscience, none is able but himself guided by the Holy Spirit; and not so guided, none than he to himself can be a worse deceiver.

To protestants, therefore, whose common rule and touchstone is the scripture, nothing can with more conscience, more equity, nothing more protestantly can be permitted, than a free and lawful debate at all times by writing, conference, or disputation of what opinion soever, disputable by scripture. Concluding that no man in religion is properly a heretic at this day, but he who maintains traditions or opinions not probable by scripture; who, for aught I know, is the papist only; he the only heretic, who counts all heretics but himself.

QUEEN MARY'S LETTER TO THE LORD CHANDOS,
ORDERING THE MANNER OF BISHOP HOOPEE'S EX-
ECUTION.

From Burnet's History of the Reformation.

Right trusty and well beloved, &c. Whereas, John Hooper, who of late was called Bishop of Worcester and Gloucester, is, by due order of the laws ecclesiastic, condemned and judged for a most obstinate, false, detestable Heretic, and committed to our secular power, to be burned, according to the wholesome* and good laws of our realm, in that case provided. Forasmuch, as in those cities, and the diocese thereof, he hath in times past preached and taught most pestilent heresies and doctrine to our subjects there; we have, therefore, given order, that the said Hooper, who yet persisteth obstinate, and hath refused mercy when it was graciously offered, shall be put to execution in the said city of Gloucester, for the example and terror of such as he hath there seduced and mis-taught, and because he hath done most harm there. And will that you, calling unto you some of reputation, dwelling in the shire, such as ye think best, shall repair unto our said city, and be at the said execution, assisting our mayor and sheriffs of the same city in this behalf.

* Very wholesome.—Such laws cured all sickness.

And forasmuch also as the said Hooper is, as here-
lies be, a vain-glorious person, and delighteth in his
tongue, and having liberty, may use his said tongue
to persuade such as he hath seduced to persist in the
miserable opinion that he hath sown among them ; our
pleasure is, therefore, and we require you to take or-
der, that the said Hooper be neither, at the time of
his execution, nor in going to the place thereof, suf-
fered to speak at large ; but thither to be led quietly,
and in silence, for eschewing further infection, and
such inconvenience as may otherwise ensue in this
part. Whereof fail not, as ye tender our pleasure.

From the Bethlehem Star.

BEWARE OF ENTHUSIASM.

A new sect of enthusiastical people have lately
arose in New-England, under the influence of a female
by the name of Betsey or Eliza W. Niles.

This wonderful person appeared a few years ago
in Windsor, Vt. and requested a hearing of the people
at the Meeting-House, while she delivered a message
from God, which she said would be confirmed to the
people by her death instantly in the pulpit.

On being refused, she immediately shut herself up
in her shop in company with a young man and his
sister, where they kept concealed, if we are rightly
informed, two nights and one day. This excited the
suspicions of some, who went to them, and found the
young man and his sister speechless and inactive, who
soon recovered their strength, but the young man ap-
peared wild and deranged.

The people being alarmed at this incident, indulged
her request, and assembled at the Meeting-House to
hear her, when she attempted to speak, but soon ap-
peared confused and deranged, and was taken to a
hospitable family, who carefully attended to any
means to render her comfortable. While at this place
she manifested a great attachment to the young man
who was concealed in the shop with her, and would

often seem to be in great distress, when nothing but a visit from him would relieve her. Some people suspecting it was their intention to form a connexion in marriage, told them at one time, that a justice was present, and if they wished to be married, to stand up, when she immediately manifested that it was her desire ; but he declined.

Not long after this she was carried to her father's house, where she became convinced that this was delusion, and wrote to the young man and his sister, that she was convinced it was a delusion, and wished them to think no more of it.

But some time in the year 1822, she commenced in this way again, and accordingly set out in pursuit of this young man, whom she pretended had received a part of the Holy Ghost by the imposition of her hands to qualify him to labor in the vineyard of the Lord with her, and had stumbled in consequence of her backsliding, and had married him another wife. After making several attempts to reach the place where she heard he resided with his family, she at length came to Elder James Spencer's of Hartford, Vt. and told his wife the Lord had called her to go to such a place, and entreated her to go with her. She soon prevailed on this woman, who began to solicit her husband's consent, but he being unwilling to trust them alone, went with them to the place, and was not a little mortified to find this revelation had led them several day's journey to see a man that was not in the place.

On her return, she wrote a letter to this man whom she called her spiritual husband, in which she acknowledged her apostacy, and relates that God had in part restored her ; but as he had received a part of her spirit, she still felt a deficiency, and then calls upon him to restore that, or to go into the vineyard with her.

But not being contented with writing, she soon took a lengthy journey to the place where he resided, and called where he was at work, and solicited a visit that evening at the house where she expected to tarry.

Not being indulged in this, she then went to a tavern near his house, and sent a boy with a line to him to visit her. After which she ventured to his house, and repeated her visits, till by her fascinating influence, she seduced him to visit her at a neighboring town, and from thence to set out with her to a neighboring state, while his wife stood weeping, with her infant in her arms, to see them depart, and remonstrating against it. But this was not an end of trials; several days after his wife arrived home, by the assistance of a benevolent female, he came home in a fit of derangement, and appeared so delirious that they were obliged to call in the neighbors to assist them; in which state he continued several weeks.

Yet notwithstanding all, she still pursued her object; for soon after his recovery, she wrote him another letter, requesting him to give her an answer whether he would go with her and perform his vow or not. At the same time, expressing her fears concerning his fate should he refuse.

During all this time she professed great sanctity and high attainments in religion, and continued to gain a powerful influence over the minds of many who soon distinguished themselves as a sect by their fanatic notions and strange exercises, such as are described in the following communication published in the *New-Hampshire Intelligencer*:

"A new sect of religious enthusiasts have lately appeared in New-England—it is understood that they began at Hartford, Vt. and first started by Betsey Niles, an old maid with but one leg. She had been joined by several persons, some of whom have heretofore been esteemed as good Christians, but in other cases, by those destitute of any principles, or good morals. They wear their hair and beards quite long; dress plain, sometimes very indecent, and pretend to be governed in all things they do, "by the movement of the spirit." They boast much of their sanctity, pretend that their hands are clean; that they are guilty of no sinful act; that they have no desire for the flesh,

their old natures being, (as they say) done away, &c. They call all others *hypocrites*, who do not join them, and pretend that they, (like the Shakers,) are the only true people of God. They are in fact nothing more or less than Shakerism modified. Their manner of worship is quite ludicrous, having no particular forms, but occasionally sit on the floor, roll and tumble, hug and kiss, being tokens, as they say, of their love.

They arrived in the back part of Newbury, on the evening of the 3d of December, 1823, ten in number, three men, six women, and one boy. Two of the men were ministers; the name of one was Daniel Quimby, that of the other will not be mentioned by reason, as it is understood, of his having left them together with his family; also having sustained a good character, and esteemed a Christian. The name of the other man was Simeon Dewey, a dissolute character, and said to have been a follower of Cochran. He is also said to be the same man who some years since, attempted to walk on the water in Hanover, N. H. but by reason of some person sawing nearly off the legs of the bench which he had ingeniously constructed under water, he was precipitated into the pond and nearly drowned.

The principal actors among the females, who yet continue with them, were Betsey Niles, and Fanny Martin, who appear to be spiritual wives to Dewey. This man has a wife in Concord, Merrimack County, N. H. and is by trade a blacksmith. Thursday evening was appointed for their meeting at the house of Mr. George, where they took up their quarters. In the fore part of the evening they sat in chairs quite silent, and near each other. One man had his arms around a woman's neck, while others were leaning on their shoulders, or reposing their heads in the women's laps. Soon Fanny Martin began to chant a hymn—having sang three or four verses, she arose and walked with much seeming reverence into the middle of the room, where she sang perhaps as many more standing. She then kneeled down, and keeping her body quite

erect, completed the hymn. She remained in this position it is judged an hour, occasionally making some appeals to the Deity, but her words seemed to have little or no connexion with each other. They were such as, "O Father"—"We are thy creatures," &c. When she arose, she called for a chair—but previous to this, she had been joined by Dewey on one knee, who, after continuing in that position for some time, arose, and seeing no vacant chair, occupied the floor, and attempted to quote some passages of Scripture, "which had struck his mind while sitting on the floor." It was this, "why do the people imagine vain things?" He made some observations to the people, boasting their own sanctity, and condemning all others. 'We did not come here, said he, to get a thanksgiving supper, nor to get your money, but, &c.'" He also remarked that they wanted to be guided by no rules of man's invention; that they were guilty of no sinful act; were nearly perfect, &c. The man's beard was about half a foot long, his hair was also very long, and combed back of his ears. He was succeeded by Betsey Niles, remaining in her chair, who seemed to be the mother of the church. She perceived he had failed in quoting the passage of Scripture, and began by saying, "why do the heathen rage, or the people imagine vain things?" She boasted rather more than the long beard man—said "they drank the pure wine, while others put too much water with it;" and exhorted the people not to be fighting against their own souls.

Elder Quimby stretched out his arms as if in great despair; hallooed very loud, which alarmed the dogs; some began to groan, very much imitating them; others to bark, and the people to look aghast.

The above is as correct representation as can be given of this meeting, and nothing is extenuated. There was no prayer, either at the opening or close of the meeting. The public feeling by this time was very much aroused, having learnt that two of the men had been found in bed with women not their wives,

which together with their pretended piety, self boasting, &c. caused the indignation of the spectators to fall upon them. Accordingly one man informed them that reports were circulating unfavorable to their conduct, and that if they were true, they had better disperse—he was followed by others, which was adding fuel to fire. They were questioned concerning the truth of the report, and wished an explanation; whether they admitted the same to be true, and if so, on what ground they justified themselves. No answer was returned. The question was then put *directly* to Elder Quimby. He had not time to answer, even if he was so disposed, before Betsey Niles replied, “and Jesus answered them nothing.” He was again questioned, and advised to clear or justify himself, when the same answer was returned as before, “and Jesus answered them nothing.” They were then informed that unless some satisfaction was made, a public complaint would be entered against them, as the law considered the offence for which they had been charged, equivalent to actual *adultery*. Elder Dewey said they feared nothing from human laws, and all seemed to exult in the idea of imprisonment, for enjoying their own consciences. A justice of the peace was present, who retired into another room, together with the young man who had seen them in bed, and made the following affidavit, which having been read in presence of the whole assembly, was sworn to, and certified in due form.

Copy of the Affidavit.

“I *Stephen George, Jr.* of Newbury, of lawful age, do testify and say, that on the 4th day of December, 1823, on going into my father’s chamber, observing some persons to be in the bed; on going to the bed, and stripping the quilt off, found them to be Elder Daniel Quimby, and ———* lying face to face close

* The name of this female is concealed at this time, considering her having left them by command of her father, but should she join them again her name will be exposed.

together. Also when I arose early in the morning, found Simeon Dewey in bed with Betsey Niles lying on his arm, and Fanny Martin lying on his breast, and further this deponent saith not."

STEPHEN GEORGE, JR.

State of Vermont, }
Orange County ss. }

Newbury, Vt. December 4, 1823.

Sworn to before me,

DAVID WILSON, Just. Peace.

When the above was read, Betsey Niles cried, "*Amen! 'tis true, 'tis true.*" When the Justice and deponent were absent making the above affidavit, Elder Quimby, being advised, arose and made some observations, tending to shew how he considered what had been done as innocent—for that they laid together to have each other's conversation, she possessing a remarkable gift for this; that he had abstained from food the whole day, having trials on his mind. He said he had a wife whom he loved, and with whom he had lived with much happiness, but since his awakening of late, he had refrained wholly from the flesh, believing it inconsistent with the gospel; and as for the harm done the girl, heaven knew his innocence, and he believed her a virtuous person.

Many other circumstances have come to light since their departure, which were known only to the man and woman of the house, but they cannot be here mentioned, some on account of their being too ridiculous, and the length of this already. It has been said they appeared to rejoice at the idea of imprisonment, but very different were their tones the next morning; the woman of the house informed them that if they were sent to the States Prison, the men and women would be confined separate, and have no intercourse with each other. At this they became confounded, some were much grieved; one in particular nearly fainted, she had to gasp for breath very much. The minister whose name is concealed, informed them boldly he had been tried a long time, considering

their conduct, and that he should leave them together with his family. They left town about sunrise on the 5th inst. In this they did contrary to agreement, as they said the evening before, they should not depart until after breakfast.

Will the public harbor any longer these deluded and degraded people? It must appear evident to every candid mind, that they are *real impostors*.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Breach of promise.—At the present term of the Supreme Court at Danby, Miss Harriet Sears, of Southeast, has obtained a verdict of \$1,000 against Mr. Gamaliel N. Benedict, of Ridgbury, for a breach of promise of marriage.—*Norwalk Gazette*.

In the "Report of the state of religion contained in the Extracts from the Minutes of the General Convention of Congregational and Presbyterian ministers in Vermont, at their session at Ludlow," the present year, it is stated that "in Townshend, between 70 and 80 give evidence, within a short time, of having become *connected* with the *invisible* church of Christ." We beg leave to ask, whether this *connexion* of *visible* with *invisible* was *clearly seen*.

"Mathew Cary, Esq. of Philadelphia, advertises that he hopes to publish, in the course of the ensuing year, a work for which he has made considerable preparations a few years since, viz. *Sketches of a history of Religious Persecution, in two volumes, 8vo.*"

We ask our correspondent on the *Religious Conference*, to excuse the omission of the remarks on the Greek words, answerable to the scriptural words *forever, eternal, damnation, &c.* partly because those words are explained in a former volume of the Repository, and partly on account of a few mistakes in the manuscript. Altho these mistakes were not of such a

nature as to effect the argument materially, they might afford matter of exultation to the conceited pedant.

The Gazetteer.—Rev. Abner Kneeland of Philadelphia, has lately commenced publishing a weekly paper in quarto, to be “appropriated to literary, religious, and moral improvement,” and likewise to contain the current news of the day. Price \$3 a year.

New Association in contemplation.—The brethren of the Universalist Society in Westmoreland, N. H. respectfully invite such of the brethren in the ministry and others as can find opportunity to attend on the second Wednesday of June next, for the purpose of public worship on that day, and to take into consideration the expediency of forming an association of Universalists in that State.

New Society.—A new society by the name of “The first Society of Universal Restorationists in Lempster, N. H. has been lately formed.

We have heard some complaints concerning the postage which some Post-Masters exact for the Christian Repository. Our account of the number of sheets it contains, we learn, by some is disputed, and an extravagant postage by such is exacted. We hope a friendly hint on this matter will suffice; for we shall endeavor to have the wrong corrected.

Elias Smith.—The following is an extract from a piece which he published in the Universalists Magazine, dated Jan. 19, 1824. “From various causes, separate from the scriptures, (about six months ago) I gave up the doctrine [“*restitution of all things*”] as doubtful, and endeavored to preach a limited salvation; but never preached endless misery; a doctrine not named in the Bible. While laboring to work my mind into a partial doctrine—I was obliged to pass by all those glorious prophecies, which speak of endless

blessings to all nations—and in the time, took particular notice of the situation of the people who thought mankind would 'be eternally separated, and a part miserable forever. I saw them divided among themselves, and miserable with all their religion. After a long struggle, as Nebuchadnezzar said, my understanding came unto me, and all appeared plain. My mind is now more clearly instructed than ever in this glorious truth; *That God has given Jesus power over all flesh, for this purpose, that he should give all flesh eternal life.*"

During the last year the number of deaths in New-York was 3444; of which 683, one fifth of the whole number, occurred from consumption. Of these deaths, 432 were colored persons.—*Gaz.*

Wiscasset, Jan. 9.

Suicide.—On Tuesday morning last, the wife of Mr. Humphrey Whidden, of Montville, put an end to her existence. She had, about three months before, joined the *Calvinistic Baptist church*, in Freedom, and appeared happy in the enjoyment of her faith, till within the last fortnight, when she manifested signs of a *troubled spirit and gloomy forebodings*, and has now terminated her wretchedness in death by her own hands. She left two children.

Gos. Her.

Words in languages.—By a reckoning made from the best dictionary for each of the following languages, there are about 20,000 words in the Spanish, 22,000 in the English, 25,000 in the Latin, 30,000 in the French, 45,000 in the Italian, 50,000 in the Greek, 80,000 in the German.—*Intel.*

Definition of Orthodoxy.—A theological student being asked the difference between orthodoxy and heterodoxy, shrewdly replied; "*Orthodoxy is my doxy, and heterodoxy is your doxy.*"—*P. Truth.*

Freedom, Me. Jan. 10, 1824.

The following note was written by Mrs. Whidden, Jan. 1, the morning she committed suicide.

"Oh my dear husband, have your little children well taken care of. Oh I never want any body blamed but myself, and I have tried all the faculties of my mind to prevent this, but woe is me that ever I was born. I can no longer be any comfort to any body living. I wish you well and every body else. Whatever becomes of me, I do not want to hurt any body but myself—and would not hurt myself if I could take any more comfort. You must bear this trouble with patience, thinking it was so to be. Oh, I would not hurt your feelings for all the world, if I could avoid it—but I am no longer fit to live!"

Mrs. W. has ever been considered as a pious and exemplary Christian.—*Han. Gaz.*

The Christian Repository is now approaching toward the close of the fourth volume. The Editor proposes still to continue it as heretofore. Those who have or do not seasonably express a wish to have their numbers discontinued, will be considered subscribers for the fifth volume. If agents will be good enough to exercise a little faithfulness in our cause, we may, doubtless, commence the next volume with an enlarged list of subscribers. Our subscribers will likewise remember that we shall need a little money for the printer. Printers and paper-makers, like many other men, want money.

OBITUARY.

DIED—in Reading, January 2, Miss Susanna Alverson, aged 21.

Lost on the 25th of November last, from on board the brig Sea Island, of Hartford, H. Barnard, Master, on her passage from New London to Matanzas, Mr. HENRY CARRIQUE, aged 20, son of the Rev. R. Carrique, editor of the Religious Inquirer. So perished a promising and active youth in the morning of life, beloved by all who knew him. Mysterious are thy ways, O Father of spirits, yet thou art just, merciful and good. May all in affliction say from the heart, "Thy will be done."—*Inq.*

DIED—at New-London, N. H. December 23d, Mr. THOMAS PIKE, in the 84th year of his age. He was an early settler in the town where he died, and a firm supporter of his country's rights. He served in two campaigns in the old French war, and was promoted to be Lieutenant in the revolutionary war, and fought in the ever memorable battle at Bunker Hill. He had for a long time been a professor of the Christian Religion, and died in the triumphant faith, of the certain salvation of all men, through Jesus Christ our Lord. A large concourse of people attended the funeral solemnities when a discourse was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Bartlett, of Hartland, Vt. from 2 Tim. iv. 7. *"I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."*

DIED at Barre, December 11, 1823, Br. WILLIAM FARWELL, in the 74th year of his age.

"He had enjoyed very good health," says our informer, "for a man of his years, till within two weeks of his death, when he fell on the ice, and about the same time took a violent colic, which terminated his mortal life. He had but just returned from his journey into New-York, New-Hampshire, and through this State, and preached the Sabbath before his confinement in this vicinity. Br. Farwell remained to the last, firm in the belief, "That the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world, and met death with christian fortitude and resignation. His wife with whom he had lived a full half century, survives him, and is happy in the faith of the gospel."

There are many things in the life, character, and labors of this aged and very faithful servant of the Lord, which, to transmit to posterity, would but render them a reasonable service. They will be happy to receive from our hands, some particular notices of those that have finished their labors with us, and have gone home before us. When our brother was a youth, the doctrine of universal salvation was but little known in this country, and scarcely was it proclaimed by a single tongue. A preacher of this faith, so long ago, as in the early part of Br. Farwell's ministry, had much to do, and much to oppose. The doctrine of good tidings of great joy which shall be unto all people, tho as old as christianity itself, was to us and many of our fathers, a new thing. While some embraced and yet as children in the faith, retained fearful apprehensions of its truth; others fought it with all possible ability and malice. It is true they could not bring us to the court of Geneva, where Servetus was doomed to the pains of fire; nor could they mingle the ashes of our bodies with those of Cranmer, Hooper, Ferrar, Latimer, Rogers, and a host of others who suffered in the days of the cruel and unrelenting Mary: but they could slander us with a poisonous tongue, and say all manner of evil

against us. They could pour a flood upon us, when we were few in number, and but just emerging from the hidden caverns of darkness.

It pleased God to call our departed brother to the commencement of the labors of his ministry, at such a time, and under such embarrassments. But he gave him strength, and a persevering spirit that was equal to his day. His faith was a tried one; his zeal was unabating; and his love unconquerable. The public, we trust, will allow us these remarks, without considering that we are dealing in extremes, when they are made acquainted with a few prominent particulars, which are embraced in the labors of his life. A long life of unremitting labors and journeyings, affords abundant testimony of these things, to those who have known him. The five first years of his ministry were without any pecuniary reward.—Not that his brethren were ungrateful; but as he was able, he was more than willing; he rejoiced that men should receive that gospel which was freely preached to the poor. He deemed it well for the foxes to have holes, and the birds of the air to have nests; but it was enough for him to be like his divine Master who “had not where to lay his head.”

Br. Farwell possessed a sensibility and sympathy, which was without a parallel, in the circle of our acquaintances. At a subject of a pathetic nature, or the recital of any thing which which was descriptive of suffering, we have frequently beheld him, as in a moment, emerged in a flood of tears. Nor were his feelings less active to whatever was of as joyous and happy nature. Such was frequently the sudden transition of his mind from the pathetic to the extatic, if the phrase be allowable, that before his tears would cease to flow, we have beheld every feature of his countenance beaming in the radiance of a smile. His heart was all alive to joy, as indeed we believe it was filled with love. Tho he sincerely and most feelingly mourned with those that mourn, and the manifested griefs of every thing in his presence that breathed seemed to light upon him, he was far from possessing a melancholy turn of mind.

He used to speak of the acuteness of his sensibility as a *weakness*; for it often embarrassed him in his public labors. But if it might properly be accounted a weakness, it was not destitute of its beauty. It answered many valuable purposes in that allotment of divine providence, in which it pleased the kind Disposer of events to place him. Such melting effusions of tenderness have poured upon the wanton and cruel, who could sport with the miseries of an innocent bird, and penetrated their hearts, like oil into one's bones. It may well be said that the lover of the works of God was at peace with the beasts of the field.

Altho Br. Farwell was said to be a very passionate man, we know of no man more free from the passion of anger or a hasty resentment. This was a peculiar circumstance. For most people, tho pious, whose feelings are easily excited, are more irascible, altho they are soon ready to forgive.

Our brother possessed not a classical education; nor was he in public speaking, what is commonly called an orator. His whole concern was to communicate the love of God to man; and tho he appeared to attach a suitable value to human literature, his mind was too much engaged in the immediate promulgation of the gospel to give it much place in his meditations. In conversation he was lively, sociable, and pleasant. He was not unfrequently argumentative on subjects of the Christian faith; so that his conversation formed a very prominent part of his ministerial labors. His divine and sentimental songs, which flowed very melodiously from his lips, was likewise made subservient to the same object. Like a speckled bird he flew almost alone; the arrows could not hit him, nor the floods drown him. He lived to see much of the fruits of his labor. Entering the gospel field in the morning of life with "two or three," the evening afforded the pleasure of beholding a multitude of fellow laborers. Many that have enjoyed the benefits of his labors have gone before him, and many are still with us, who will long retain him in grateful remembrance. *Blessed are the peace-makers; for they shall be called the children of God.*"

From the Gospel Herald.

DEATH OF BR. BIGELOW.

To the Editor,

Sir—It falls to my lot to communicate to you the painful intelligence of the death of Br. Timothy Bigelow, and his worthy consort. She died on the 11th day of last month, and he on the 5th of this present month. Both died of fever, at their usual residence, in Palmyra, Portage county, Ohio; soon after his return from a tour to the westward. Death, this season, stalks through the land, wresting from us some of our most useful citizens and best of friends, having no respect of persons. It remains to be said, that an afflicted family has been deprived of the most affectionate and tender parents. They could always realize in every act of their kind parents, the example of their heavenly Father, who "is good unto all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." The friends of truth have sustained a loss which will indeed be sorely felt in all their religious circles. For Mr. Bigelow was a man who possessed superior abilities; warm in his affections, devout in all his religious performances, and ardent in his zeal for truth. The pathetic effusions of his soul have often been poured out to his

audience, exhibiting to the people the glorious attributes of the only true God, warming their hearts with the fire of divine love. The loss is to be regretted by all who feel interested in the promulgation of the truths of the gospel. but God is wise in all his dealings with us, and we must submit. Br. Bigelow has fought a good fight, has finished his course, he has kept the faith : henceforth there is laid up for him a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give him in that day. Both he and his companion died firm and unshaken in their faith, of the doctrine which they had so warmly advocated for years past, unto the very last moment, confirming the glorious doctrines of universal reconciliation, with their dying breath.

THEOPHILUS COTTON.

Austintown, (Ohio,) Nov. 9, 1823.

From the Boston Recorder.

And Hagar sat over against him and wept .Gen. XXI.

Did not the tear in Hagar's eye,
As o'er her dying son she knelt,
In speechless, silent agony,
Show what the anxious mother felt ?

And when she softly breath'd her pray'r,
Her tearful eye uprais'd to heaven,
Did not the anguish, beaming there,
Show how the mother's heart was riven ?

Then when in sweetest accents fell
The voice from heaven—"thy son shall live !"
Think ye an angel's tongue can tell
The joys that bade her heart revive ?

O, there's a something in the tear
That dims a mother's kindling eye ;
A charm so fraught with love—so dear—
We weep—we know not—care not, why.

Yes—if a spark was ever given
To mortals, from the fires above ;
If e'er a flow'r that bloom'd in heaven,
It is a mother's tender love.

For the Christian Repository.

AN INVOCATION TO DEITY.

Oh, thou, to whom all nature humbly bows !
 On thee I call ; to thee I pay my vows :
 Do thou my bosom fill with sacred fire,
 And raise from earth to heaven each low desire.
 Inspire my soul with pure devotion's glow,
 That I my God and my best good may know.

How oft alas, do sin and Satan rage,
 And strive, by art, my passions to engage !
 While low desires, that grovel in the dust,
 Would fain allure to av'rice, pride or lust ;
 And bind to earth these nobler powers that rise
 On wings of faith and hope above the skies !

Bright King of glory, God of boundless grace,
 Assist me now thy character to trace.
 Fain would I fly to thee, my God, my all,
 And leave behind, this mean terrestrial ball !
 When raptures rising fill this soul with love,
 Thou seem'st engaging as the gentle dove ;
 Yea, altogether lovely dost appear,
 And chiefest 'mong ten thousand thousand fair.
 No earthly tongue thy charms can ever tell,
 Nor pen portray, nor pencil touch with skill.
 Thou art the centre of my soul's delight,
 My joy each day, my pleasure every night :
 Thou art my Sun, my light, my life, my all ;
 My meat, my drink, thou givest when I call.
 When sorrows rise, and tears flow down amain—
 When sickness rages, and when rack'd with pain—
 Thine arm, unseen, supports me, calms my fear,
 And kindly wipes away each falling tear.
 Oh may my soul to thee forever cleave,
 Till time, and sense, and sin, and earth, I leave,
 Then soar aloft, on angels' pinions borne,
 And mingle with bless'd spirits round thy throne.

— D. S****r.

CHRISTIAN REPOSITORY.

No. 6.

APRIL, 1824.

VOL. IV.

SERMON XV.

Matt. xxii. 39. *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*

It is with infinite justice and propriety, that this precept is connected with that which enjoins the love of God; and that both, when taken together, are said to constitute the sum and substance of the divine law. All duties, prescribed by the Supreme Being, must of necessity have reference to him, and to the creatures he has made; and these duties must be conjoined; there must not only be no opposition between them, but they must be in the most perfect union, so that the performance of one shall involve the performance of the other. To this purpose, we are told, that he "who says, he loves God and hateth his brother, is a liar, and the truth is not in him;" and again, "if a man love not his brother, whom he *hath* seen, how can he love God, whom he hath *not* seen?" Our Lord was asked by a doctor of the law, "which was the great commandment of the law?" He was answered, "thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, This is the first, and great commandment. And the second is like unto it; thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." It is certainly, the very essence of moral justice, that we should revere, serve, obey and love the Author of our existence; and it is equally just, that we should exercise an affectionate regard to those who bear the divine image, and by every mean in our power, aim to promote their interest and welfare. The doctrine of true holiness, and the scriptural theory of moral justice are not so abstract and intricate subjects, as they have generally been considered. Moral justice seeks the highest glory of God, through the highest felicity of man. And if both these objects are not secured, justice has not received its demands; and if

one is attained to the exclusion of the other, the likeness between the first and second commands is destroyed, and "the things which God hath joined together, are put asunder."

That man should love his neighbor as himself is a precept, however, which requires a very careful examination, especially, when made the foundation of a public discourse. It furnishes an important doctrine, nay, it contains the substance of all the doctrine advanced in the Bible. It is the whole gospel in miniature; and what is more, it is the great law by which both worlds are regulated, inasmuch as it enjoins that which makes earth resemble heaven, and constitutes all, of which we can conceive, of celestial beatitude. Talk as learnedly as you please of future blessedness; place heaven where you will, yet the man of reflection and discernment, will neither expect nor desire a higher glory, or more exalted joy than he sees presented in the words before us. These are considerations which render the proper discussion of the text, important, and the full understanding of its import, an object of vast consequence.

The general observations which have been made upon the nature and relation of the duties enjoined in the law of God, lead to the consideration of the *standard* by which our conduct is to be regulated, in fulfilling this precept. The discussion of this point will form the first branch of the discourse.

The fulfillment of any command seems to imply a standard, or rule, by which the subject of the law governs himself in the act of obedience. In the present case, this fact is peculiarly obvious. It does not appear, that the divine law is a positive, arbitrary institution; that is, its moral requisitions are not so. The literal, or ceremonial parts of the law might have been so; and indeed we should have expected that many requirements, made of the house of Israel would be of a positive character. They were in a state of infancy, as respected their intellectual and moral characters and powers, at the time the law was

given; and hence they were treated much as we treat children, in the first laws, which we prescribe for the regulation of their conduct. These must of necessity be positive, and apparently arbitrary. We endeavor to form habits of obedience, before the subject is able to know why he ought to obey, and without setting up any standard of obedience but our own will. This answers for the first rudiments of instruction; and the whole of the ritual part of the divine law, was nothing more than the mere "rudiments of the world." But the case is altered when we come to the spirituality of the divine law. The subject must know why he is to obey, and he must be acquainted with some principle, which shall define the extent, and dictate the character of his obedience. In applying these remarks to the present case, we will suppose, that the law required a love to our neighbor, equal in degree or extent to that which Deity himself exercises towards man. Now in this case, all will grant that the standard of duty is too high for beings like ourselves. We could not expect to reach it. We should forever "come short of the glory of God." A finite being can never do that which belongs only to the Infinite Being to do. Laws, to be just, must be accommodated to the age, capacities and powers of the subjects. A child may be employed in the same service, and influenced by the same motives as his father; but he cannot be expected to perform as much labor in a given time; and to require it would be unjust, and to expect it, absurd. We will suppose, again, that man were required to love his neighbor, with the affection that glows in an angel's breast; say that he was told to imitate "the rapt seraph, that adores and burns," yet in this case, though the standard of moral duty is lowered, we are still left at uncertainty; the rule is too vague and indefinite to be followed. We know nothing of the degree of affection which superior beings exercise towards each other, or toward inferior grades of beings. It is unnecessary to multiply cases by way of supposition. It is sufficient to observe, that in fixing

the standard of moral virtue, the great legislator has avoided all the cases, which present impossibilities or leave the rule indefinite. In a word, we have a rule of duty, clearly defined, and graduated according to the powers we possess, and this rule is not in heaven, that we should inquire, "who shall ascend to bring it down to us," neither in the deep, that we should ask, "who shall descend to bring it up to us." The word is nigh us, even in our heart, and in our mouth. We love ourselves, and we either know or may know with what degree or extent of affection, and hence we are enabled to determine the nature and extent of the affection which God requires of us towards our neighbor.

But self-love is a vicious principle, for this very reason, that it is selfish. A Christian must be divested of self, become totally disinterested, and every feeling of his soul be absorbed in a regard to the glory of God." This is the grave doctrine of "the wisdom of this world, which," thank God, "cometh to nought," and when it does so, it is no more than resolved into its original material. But if self-love is so highly criminal, is it not strange indeed, that he who understood the whole mechanism of the heart, should not have denounced it, and cautioned his followers to beware of its corrupting influence? Is it not passing strange, that he "who spake as never man spake," should not only not denounce this principle, but incorporate it into his gospel, make it an influential motive in his religion, and establish it as the proper standard of brotherly love? Tell us, ye, who understand "the words of the wise and their dark sayings." Solve, if you can, this perplexing enigma. But perhaps we shall need but little aid. Possibly the mystery may be cleared up, without any extraneous assistance. You must know then, that the glory of God, to which it is said, all feelings should be subordinate, is represented as having no necessary relation to human happiness. When the divine glory is thus defined, it is a matter of importance to lay self out of

the question, in order to form a seeming correspondence between the two parts of the system. It was known, that man loves himself, and that his self-love would, in all probability, rise against this scheme, and accordingly, care must be taken to dispose of the principle beforehand ; as despotic princes disarm their subjects, who, they suppose would use their arms in defence of their rights and immunities. This is my method of explanation, and I shall remain contented with it, till I find one that appears more rational. It does not particularly explain why our Savior admitted the use of self-love ; but it shows why others decry and condemn it, and why all kinds of self-love are ranked together, as if they are alike vicious, and reprehensible.

There is then, a distinction which ought to be noticed, between gross self-love, and that which the divine law makes the standard of charity. A man may love himself in such a way, as to have no love to his neighbor. This is that exclusive principle, which may be denominated self-love perverted. That Christ had no reference to this kind of self-love, is too evident to require proof : and that the systems to which I have briefly adverted make great use of it, is equally evident. It is in fact, the grand desideratum. Let a man feel no concern for the happiness of others, and he will be considered free from selfishness. True, the system supposes, he must be as willing to fail of his own felicity, if the glory of God requires, as to see his neighbors fail. But there is nothing risked here. This very willingness to be lost, is the surest pledge of eternal salvation. It is then, that in professing to lay aside all self, people are inordinately selfish ; and what is called the glory of God is made to consist in a grossly perverted principle of the human heart, in that blind, and contracted self-love, which can neither excite a regard to others, nor move to deeds, or even to thoughts of benevolence.

From these considerations, we pass to notice more particularly, the relation between self-love and social.

This will form the second and last head of the discourse.

And here we may judge by comparison. We may determine how the misery of man is increased, or to say the least, not mitigated or removed by the gross passion, which we have mentioned; and with equal certainty, we may determine the relation between the principle, recommended in the text, and the welfare and good of society. The exclusive principle, is reprobated in every part of the gospel. The pharisaic Jews had much of it. "They shut the kingdom of heaven against men." They denied the Gentiles the privileges and blessings of the Messiah's kingdom. They were selfish in the grossest sense of the term. They loved themselves, not only better than their neighbor, but to the exclusion of their neighbor. In the parable of the man who had fallen among thieves, we have a beautiful exemplification of the exercise of the two kinds of self-love. The priest and Levite passed by the wounded man, on the other side. This conduct was the effect of selfishness. This was self-love perverted. How much honor these men claimed for acting with a view to the divine glory, we are not told. That they might put in a claim is quite evident, and with equal propriety, with many others. But the Samaritan had compassion on the miserable traveller; "he went to the place where he was, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine." This, and his subsequent conduct was truly noble and benevolent. But we are not to say, that self was not so far consulted, as to regulate the conduct of this good man. As I would not assert that the Samaritan had no self-love, so neither would I alledge that this was the ruling principle of his charitable regard. It is sufficient to consider the principle as the standard or measure of his benevolence. This is all that the present subject demands. If we would "do to others, as we would they should do to us," we must certainly examine our own minds, to ascertain what we would have done for us in certain circumstances, and this must

become the measure of our deeds of mercy towards our neighbors. Ethical writers are not agreed, as to the real character of self-love, whether it is the inspiring principle of benevolence or not, or whether or not, all benevolence may be resolved into self-love. I shall not discuss these questions now; tho at a future time I may attempt it. It is enough that we find this principle to form the bound and measure of our kindest regard.

It is moreover essential to a correct understanding of the subject, and a proper discharge of the duty enjoined in the text, to remember, that this self love is to be considered not as weak or blind, but as a spirit of discernment, enabling us to discover what would really contribute to our welfare, and of course do that for others, which we believe will make them most happy, under existing circumstances. The importance of this idea is manifest. A man may appeal to our charity, and demand or ask that which would, if communicated, prove essentially injurious. This compliance with such a request is not charity. It is not the love of our neighbor. If we appeal to self-love to decide our course of conduct in this case, it must be to that principle as connected with intelligence, and showing us what is really a good, as distinguished from what only appears to be so. Dr. Young has told us of "self-love in a mistake, a poor, blind merchant, buying joys too dear:" and he speaks again, of "self-love in her wits, and growing rich in bargains of delight." We should ask ourselves, what would we, in our sober senses, have done for us in such a situation, and take our measures accordingly. The good which we may do, or communicate, does not consist in any one particular thing. It will vary according to circumstances; and that will be the greatest good which proves of the greatest use in existing circumstances, but not always that which our humor or caprice lead us to consider as a good. The divine conduct seems to be governed by the same rule. God does not always bestow what we ask for; if he did,

we have reason to think our condition would be still more miserable than it is. "Not to my wish, but to my want," should be every Christian's prayer. "Ye ask," says St. James, "and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts." The love of God forbids the granting such petitions.

I may conclude with remarking, that the theory of self-love, which we have presented, sufficiently indicates our path of duty. If we would be known to love God, we must love mankind, for the two precepts are conjoined in the gospel: and on the "love of God and of our neighbor as ourselves, hang all the law and the prophets:"

From the Christian Intelligencer.

A HINT TO YOUNG PREACHERS.

Something like a year after entering upon the duties of the ministry, I spent an evening with a venerable and worthy gentleman, who afterwards became my father-in-law. He was of the Baptist persuasion, and a bright ornament to his profession. Among other topics of conversation, that of *great Preachers* became a subject of discourse. Full of enthusiastic zeal, and favored by Providence with a ready utterance, and a commanding voice, I had succeeded in my itinerant labors very far beyond my expectations; and withal felt some itchings to become a *great Preacher*. I mentioned the names of some in my own order, the splendor of whose talents eclipsed, in my opinion, the brilliancy of all others. The old gentleman in turn, enumerated a number who were the most distinguished among the Baptist. But, said he, for my part, I prefer a *good preacher* to a *great one*. These words connected with the artless and sound gravity with which they were uttered, touched the very quick of my soul. I saw the propriety of them, and after meditating upon them a short time, settled down upon the resolution to become a *good preacher*, if possible,

and never to indulge the inquietude about *ministerial greatness*. Tho this occurrence was almost twenty years ago, I have not, I believe, from that time to this, arranged a sermon, without recollecting the remark of my venerable friend and parent. Will the discourse be a good one? This circumstance, it is believed, tho trivial in itself, may be useful to those who have just commenced their labors in "the ministry of reconciliation." They are prone to thirst for professional eminence, and if they associate in their mind, genuine eminence with real holiness and moral virtue, the desire is commendable and salutary. But the glare of splendid talents, the charm of popularity, and of public applause are too apt to dazzle their eyes and deceive their hearts. I have rarely known an instance in which a preacher, young or old, attempted to deliver, what the world would call a great sermon, without failing, and tormenting his audience with a bad one. A great sermon, in the popular acceptance of the term, is one in which the sentiments and descriptions soar far beyond common capacities. Now a moment's sober reflection will convince us, that a sentiment, or a description so humble that our loftier vision cannot perceive it, is as suitable and as useful to us as the one which soars so sublimely that our little eyes cannot reach it. Let the minister of Christ bear constantly in mind that goodness is sterling greatness, and he will walk in the right way, "the path of the just that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." These hasty remarks, may, if duly improved, be profitable to societies which are destitute of the stated ministry of the word. Guided by the rule here recommended, they will find but little difficulty in obtaining an acceptable preacher; one who will promote their growth in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. They should remember that there are, comparatively, but few in the vineyard of our Lord and Master, who are distinguished for natural talents, but many, who let their measure of "light shine before men." I close

my remarks by repeating that goodness is sterling greatness; and the only greatness about which a rational creature can, with propriety, indulge a moment's anxiety. S. S.

EXTRACT FROM A SERMON ON HABITUAL DEVOTION, PS.
X. 4.—BY REV. JOHN CLARKE, D. D.

That the potent majesty of God should always possess our minds is not to be expected. The invariable contemplation of any one object (were it possible) would absolutely unfit us for the duties of life, and for the station in which we are placed. Whilst we continue in this world, we must experience many cares, and pursue many concerns of a merely temporal nature. We must make provision for our families; we must educate our children, and introduce them into life. The farmer must cultivate his lands. The merchant must attend to the objects of commerce. The mechanic must practise his art. The statesman must study the interests of his country, and concert measures for its security. The legislator must make laws, and the magistrate execute them. The judge must hear, and the advocate plead causes. The physician must attend to the duties of his humane office; and men of all professions must act in the line of their calling. There is such a thing as the business of life, and that business must be attended to.

But such attention would be impossible, were God, in the literal sense, in all our thoughts. Were his infinite and adorable majesty to be the sole object of our contemplation, the business of life would stand still. With such a powerful image before us, we could not so far command our thoughts, as to attend to any thing but the excellencies of his nature. We should be dead to the world around us, and indifferent to all its concerns. The active powers of the mind would undergo a total relaxation; and the various duties, upon which the existence of society depends, would be altogether neglected.

In all ages, there have been some enthusiasts, who have endeavored to perfect their nature by divine contemplations. For this purpose they have retreated from the world ; forsaken its pleasures ; abandoned its cares ; and taken up their melancholy abode, either with the beasts of the desert, or with persons of their own enthusiastic turn. But their zeal has never recommended them to the more enlightened part of mankind. From their contemplative lives religion has derived no credit, and human nature no honor.— Nor have they themselves outstripped others in their advances towards perfection.

But such useless, such inactive beings should we all become, did our religion oblige us to exclude all thoughts, but those which terminate in God. As the faint rays, which proceed from the distant stars, are lost in the beams of the sun, so would all other ideas be swallowed up in those of the divinity. The blessings of life would be overlooked. Our country, our families, our friends, our liberty, and even our lives, would be regarded as objects of utter indifference.— We should have no hearts to feel ; no spirit to act. In short, our social nature would undergo an entire change, were we to call off the mind from all objects but the Supreme Being ; and to abandon every pursuit, but the contemplation of his majesty.

It is plain, then, that David does not condemn the wicked, because that God was not, in *this* sense, in all their thoughts. Far other was the ground of his complaint. His controversy with the licentious part of mankind arose from that habitual thoughtlessness of God, and contempt of his governing authority, which appeared in all their words and actions. He condemned them, because, so far from setting God always before them, they studiously endeavored to banish him from their minds ; because they never raised their eyes to him, either by way of gratitude or admiration ; because they perversely endeavored to keep out of view the perfections of his nature, his universal presence, his particular providence, his moral government,

his righteous laws, his just expectations from the human kind, and the future account, which every one must give. Truths so opposite to their principles and practices, could not be welcome to the wicked. As objects of contemplation they could afford them no pleasure ; and for this reason, these transgressors not only neglected to call them up, but treated them as intruders, whenever they found their way into their minds, or solicited their attention. This was the great impiety, against which the monarch protests in so many places ; and to which he particularly alludes in the passage before us.

God is a being to whom we all stand in the most important relation : he is the former of our bodies, and the father of our spirits : as he originally made, so he upholds us in being : he gives us all the good things which we enjoy ; and he preserves us amid the numerous evils with which we are surrounded.—Throughout universal nature he is always present : he is intimately acquainted with the state and employment of our minds ; and he is a spectator of all the actions of our lives : he is our supreme governor ; and as such, has signified his pleasure, and required obedience. Finally, he is our judge ; and upon his righteous decision must depend our condition in the approaching state. Such is the great God, such his character, and such the mutual relation of him and his creatures.

How proper then is it that such a being should often employ our serious meditation ? Ought we not frequently to survey the perfections of his nature, and gratefully to remember our obligations to his goodness ? Ought not the mind to be in such a state, that the visible creation and the events of providence will readily awaken the idea of a God ? Though we cannot confine all our contemplations to him, yet is it not reasonable that we should cultivate a spirit of habitual devotion ? Surely, it is : and consequently the psalmist has justly condemned those, “who have not God in all their thoughts.”

And from this view of the subject, we may easily determine against what particular description of men the same charge may be now urged. They who seldom reflect on a power above; they who do not trace the wisdom, power, and goodness of God in the works of nature, and dispensations of providence; they who do not habitually keep in mind that God is a moral governor, and all men his subjects; they, in one word, who do not employ their thoughts upon any of those objects or duties, which more immediately respect the most high, may be ranked among those practical atheists, which David, in the passage before us, meant to expose. They put the thoughts of God far from them; and they desire not the knowledge of his ways.

From the Christian Intelligencer.

SUPERSTITION AND LIBERALITY CONTRASTED.

Returning from Saratoga Springs, a few years since, the writer found it necessary, in order to meet his appointment on the Sabbath, to ride late the evening preceding. Finding no inn, he called for entertainment at a private house, and was informed of a *stopping-place*, a few miles ahead; again inquiring, they had *taken down their sign*, but said the people at a house a short distance further, were *always prepared for travellers*. Arriving there, the men were all in bed, and could not get up, but said, *down at the store*, at Esq. L.'s the conveniences were good. I told them it was late, the day had been extremely hot, my ride very irksome, and, that a distance of three miles more, would be sensibly felt, even admitting I could be sure of finding entertainment; which would be extremely uncertain. But a few frail excuses were blundered out, and Esq. L.'s folks were declared to be *pious people*, and would not suffer the needy to call, unnoticed and unblest. At length, the weary, dust-covered traveller arrived at the declared asylum for the desti-

tute, suffering pilgrim, whom irreligion had coldly neglected. Calling to some men standing before the store, inquiry was made, whether the gentleman of the house was at home; the answer was in the negative, but that his lady was present. He was asked, if they were charitable people, and professed the christian religion. He said, they did make that profession, and were very good people, too. Half choaked with the innumerable particles inhaled with the dusty atmosphere, so fatigued, as to be just able to crawl into the house, I saw the mistress of the family, seated by the window, in a large armed chair, rocking herself into apparent sleep. Said I, *kind lady*, will you have the goodness to entertain a poor unfortunate stranger this evening? She replied, "We cannot, sir." Indeed, good woman, perhaps you have not sufficiently acquainted yourself with the situation of your petitioner. I am exhausted by travelling, have called several times and found no rest for my poor body, but was encouraged to press on to this place, where I should not fail of finding the stranger's friend and the pilgrim's home. Without scarcely opening her eyes, she said there was a tavern not more than three or four miles ahead, and it would be *right* for them to entertain me. Sighing for disappointment, the writer observed, that tho he solicited entertainment as a beggar, he was not altogether moneyless, but would return tearful thanks in paying for a pillow, on which to lay his head, for the night. Mrs. L. said it was against her principle to entertain people on *Saturday evening*. I told her, that, on hearing they professed the religion of him whom I delighted to serve, no doubt existed, but they would entertain the weary strangers, as thereby some had entertained angels unawares.

After riding a short distance, I heard and saw a number of men, with teams, collecting hay, at that late hour. From them a man came riding, of whom I learned, that the laborers were in the employment

of Esq. L. at whose house I had just called, and from principle been denied a resting place. Giving him a short history of the treatment towards me, he very mildly apologized for Mrs. L. by saying, she was a fine pious woman as ever lived ; but that the family were *Separatists* or Puritans, and as the next day was Communion, in their Church, either the husband or the wife must fast and abstain from all worldly concerns, the evening preceding. He added, that Mr. L. had a great quantity of hay out, then ready to go in, and must take the charge of his hands, in securing it that night, and his wife was undergoing the affliction, necessary for them both, before the Communion. Any other time, he said, Mrs. L. would be found a tender-hearted, good woman as lived in the world. He appeared perfectly serious and candid in his statements. Musing, as I rode along, I was led to inquire, what analogy the *Separatist* principle had to Christianity. It was easy to demonstrate; however, that the woman was a *separatist* ; for her profession had *separated* her from reason, religion, and the natural benevolence of her own heart.

I concluded there was a good opportunity to try an experiment. Soon discovering two men at a door, I asked them, if they knew of a wicked *Universalist* in that vicinity ! One replied, that he knew of Universalists ; but did not know as they were *more wicked* than other people. A man, he continued, who professed that faith, passed a few minutes before, and had gone home ; pointing across a stream to his house. Without making further inquiry, I went to his door and called. "Who's there ?" said the man within. A poor beggar, destitute and neglected, I replied. He soon opened the door, saying, "My house is the home for all such. You will want something to eat, I suppose—what will you have ?" Not any thing, said I, for myself ; but my beast will want feeding. "Your beast !" he replied ; "I thought you were on foot—I hope you are not so wretched as I am

afraid—have you met with any great misfortune that you should have to beg for entertainment?" I told him I had met with nothing more, than to be denied a bed on which to sleep, because it was *Saturday evening*.

Having provided a light, he began to gaze and smile, saying, "But it appears to me you don't look much like a beggar—I should have thought you were a minister." His lady calling him to the bed-room, told him with a low voice, she had mistrusted it was the minister, who was to preach there the next day. He returned, and looking me earnestly in the face, without further ceremony, embraced my hand, tho' totally unacquainted, and with eyes as full of tears, as his heart was of joy, declared, he never so sensibly felt the force of the passage of the good Book, "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby have some entertained angels unawares."

The Editor has not published this comparatively trifling, but really true account, neither for the sake of amusement, nor unfair crimination of others' conduct. The principal motive is, to admonish my readers, against imbibing these superstitions in profession, which prevent the exercise of the natural, generous feelings of the heart. As much as ministers declaim against the corruptions of our nature, those of tradition and bad habits, are much worse. The most critical examination of the subject will justify the remark. Several things are peculiarly observable in the account just given of profession and practice.

1. Notwithstanding the dear woman was naturally possessed of a kind and generous disposition, and had the esteem and friendship of her neighbors, and would commonly do honor to the christian profession, still, there was one evening in four weeks, in which her *conscience* forbade her showing mercy to the weary sojourner! Hence it is evident, that her improper conduct was the result of a mistake; no censurable motive being ascribable to that article of the Puritan

profession. It is really unaccountable, that the dominion of priestcraft and superstition should, so long, and in so many different ways, be perpetuated, in this enlightened age and country. That people should read the scriptures in their own tongue, be conversant with the history of our blessed Lord, of his benevolent professions and miracles of mercy ; read his solemn and reiterated commands to his followers, to do unto others, as they would be done by, and yet, suppose his religion would forbid the entertainment of strangers, is truly astonishing ; more strikingly marvellous is the consideration, that the good woman was undergoing a preparatory affliction, for the sacramental commemoration of our Savior's sufferings and death. May we not venture to suggest, that if their profession of religion had embraced the sentiment, that his death was designed for the good of all men, natural and revealed religion would have co-operated, and the one served to strengthen and do honor to the other ?

2. This exhibition of superstition is commendable, in comparison with many instances of it, discoverable in the Christian community. There was no inquiry, whether the traveller was a professor or not ; whether of one denomination or of another. In this respect, the profession and practice were impartial. But how often is it the case, that a man, or his helpless family, is left to the mercy of the elements, or put to the most cruel death, for a supposed heretical faith ? How frequently, even at this day, do we see neighbors and former friends, standing at scornful distance from each other, on account of different views on religious subjects ? Brothers will be at variance, parents and children contend and almost fight, and husband and wife exercise the bitterest feelings, merely for difference of opinion ! All these things are the unholy offspring of priestcraft and superstition. An abuse of the kindest blessings, generally produces the worst consequences. A noble institution dishonored, is an

almost irreparable injury. Not so with a mean profession; that only forms a contrast of something better. But a mistaken judgement makes abused Christianity coalesce with the most mischievous institutions, and from that circumstance, draws inferences unfriendly to the whole, and confirmed infidelity is the consequence. O, ye professors of our holy religion, strive to cultivate peace and good will among men, that the cause of our Lord be not wounded and dishonored by your means.

5. The Universalist, on whom the beggar called, hesitated not a moment in opening his door, and bidding him welcome. O, ye of like profession, imitate his example. Of all men, you are under the greatest obligation to be liberal and merciful. It is hoped that this recorded instance of Christian generosity, so honorable to our holy profession, will be duly noticed and imitated, by the readers of the *Intelligencer*, their example prove salutary with others, till Christianity universally prevail, and the reign of human wretchedness be exchanged for scenes of rational rejoicing and delight.

From the Christian Disciple.

WAS JESUS CHRIST A LITERAL SACRIFICE?

In reading the New Testament, especially the epistles, we meet with language like the following, in relation to "the author and finisher of our faith."—"This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many, for the remission of sins."*—"Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world."†—"For even Christ, our passover, is sacrificed for us."‡—"Who, his own self, bare our sins in his own body on the tree."§ "Christ also hath loved us, and given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice

* Matth. xvi. 28. Luke xxii. 20.

† John i. 29.

‡ 1 Cor. v. 7.

§ 1 Pet. ii. 24.

to God.”* “We are sanctified through the offering up of the body of Jesus Christ.” “This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins.”—“How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Eternal spirit offered himself, without spot, to God, purge your consciences :”—“He appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself.” “Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many :”† with many other passages, not, perhaps, more strong and prominent, but of the same general character.‡

The question very naturally arises in the mind of a serious reader of the scriptures, whether this language is to receive a *literal*, or a *figurative* construction. This is an important inquiry. If we say it is to be construed *strictly* or *literally*, the consequence seems irresistibly to follow, that Jesus Christ was offered, or that he offered himself, as an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of either a part or the whole of the human race : that by his blood the Creator was rendered propitious to his creatures ; or that Jesus was, in the words of the Westminster divines§ *literally* and properly, “a sacrifice to satisfy divine Justice :” and we must receive that as the doctrine of the scriptures, and convert it as we may to our spiritual nourishment ; and to the correction and elevation of our views of the divine character and government. But if on the other hand, we are to give all this sacrificial language a *metaphorical* or *figurative* construction, the doctrine just stated will derive from it no support ; and we shall be left free to understand it in a manner which shall accord with the known and ordinary principles of the moral government of God : with those views of his character which are given us in other parts of the scripture ; and with the ordinary acceptation of the same or similar language applied by the sacred writers to other persons and things.

* Eph. v. 2.

† Heb. x. 10. 12. ix. 14. 26 28.

‡ Vide Mark xiv. 24. 1 Cor. xi. 24. 2 Cor. v. 21. 1 John ii. 2. iv. 10.

§ Westminster Catechism, Qu. 25.

In relation to the exposition of the scriptures there is no question more important than this now before us, whether the sacrificial language used by the sacred writers in respect to Jesus Christ is to be construed strictly or metaphorically. We ought, then, to come to the question as those who are to give an account ;—who are to answer, at a future day, for our use or abuse of the treasures of heavenly wisdom which are entrusted to our charge :—for our use or abuse of those high faculties, to which the Divine Being has addressed the revelation of his character and purposes contained in the sacred volume ; and as those who ought to be ready to answer for that easy credulity which believes too much, not less than for that cautious skepticism which at last believes too little.

We begin the inquiry, then, by remarking that, if the passages in the New Testament which speak of Jesus as a sacrifice to God, when *strictly* construed, shall be found to harmonize with each other, and with other plain passages of the scriptures, and with known facts, then they *may* be construed literally : altho, at the same time, if, when understood *figuratively*, they be equally harmonious with known facts, with other parts of scripture, and with the usages of language, they *may* also be construed figuratively : and, in that case, it might still remain a question whether a figurative or a literal construction should prevail. But if these several passages, when construed *literally*, be found to contradict *other passages of scripture, or certain known facts, or each other*, then, the literal *must* be abandoned for a metaphorical construction.

How then, in the first place, does the effect produced upon the mind by understanding literally the several passages quoted from the New Testament, in the beginning of this article, and others like them, harmonize with language like the following ? “Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil ? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for

the sin of my soul?"* "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; burnt offering and sin offering thou hast not required."† "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it; thou delightest not in burnt offering."‡ "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper, but, whose confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy."§ "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord and he will have mercy upon him, even to our God for he will abundantly pardon."¶ These are but a few from a multitude of texts in the Old Testament either expressly declaring, or plainly implying, that our Heavenly Father, who is also our Judge, is ready to forgive the penitent merely in consideration, or on condition, of his repentance and reformation: and that a literal sacrifice, either of man or beast, considered as a religious act, or any thing more than a security, or a test, of allegiance to the Jewish theocracy, is not what God requires at the hand of his creatures.—The same impression is deepened when we find this language quoted from the Old Testament into the New: "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not;—in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast no pleasure:"‡ and when we hear Jesus himself approving and confirming the opinion of the scribe,** that to love God and our neighbor is more than all whole burnt offering and sacrifice.—From this latter class of texts, according to the only construction of which they appear to be capable, we infer irresistibly that pardon is ready and free to the penitent, and that it depends, in no case, upon the condition of any offering or sacrifice for sin: while, from the former class, if construed literally, the conviction seems equally irresistible that Jesus, our Lord, has become

* Mich. vi. 7.

† Ps. li. 16.

‡ Isaiah lv. 7.

** Mark xii. 33.

† Ps. xl. 6.

‡ Prov. xxviii. 13.

¶ Heb. x. 5, 6.

a Savior by having offered himself up as a proper sacrifice to propitiate his Father, by expiating our sins.—Are these representations of the divine proceedings consistent with each other? Does not a literal construction of the former class of texts make them irreconcilable with the latter class?—There certainly appears to be either discord between them, or, what is no better than discord—“harmony not understood.”

Secondly:—Does the doctrine that Jesus was a proper sacrifice, which seems to result from a literal construction of the sacrificial language applied to him in the New Testament, agree with *known facts*?

It must be granted,—no one will deny, that if Christ was literally a sacrifice to God, *he must have been offered as such*: he must have been put to death by some one as a sacrifice. For the very notion of a sacrifice is that of a religious offering made by some person or persons to some God or Gods, as a religious act. There is no prayer, where there is no intent to pray. In the idea of a gift, is embraced that of a giver. There can be no sacrifice where there is not an *offering made with a sacrificial intent*. If Jesus then was a sacrifice, who sacrificed him?

1. Was he offered, as a sacrifice, by the *Romans*? They were his immediate executioners. It was a Roman magistrate that pronounced sentence of death against him:—a Roman soldiery that executed that sentence:—a Roman spear that pierced his side.—Was he offered, as a sacrifice, by the Romans?—To this hypothesis it may be objected, in the first place, that *human sacrifices were never allowed by the established laws of Rome*. It is true that a few, very few, cases of human sacrifices can be found in Roman history during the eight hundred years from the foundation of the city to the death of Christ. Some time after Christ, during the reign of Nero or Vespasian, Pliny* states that human sacrifices sometimes oc-

* Ap. Jahn. Archæologia Bib. † 404.

curred in Rome. But, before that declining period of Roman greatness and virtue, we find but a single instance in which human sacrifices were offered in Rome, to propitiate the gods: and this took place nearly two centuries before Christ, when the approach of Hannibal to its gates had thrown the city into the utmost consternation.* But the historian, to whom we are indebted for the knowledge of this fact, assures us that the place had never before been stained by his countrymen with the blood of human victims.† And from the terms of abhorrence in which the Romans, at that very time, speak of those nations which sacrificed even their prisoners of war, we learn in what detestation human sacrifices were held by that people.‡

To the present hypothesis it may be objected, secondly, that *Rome*, the city itself, was the *only place in which human victims were ever offered by the Romans*. But Jesus was put to death in Judea.—A third objection is that, among the Romans, *all sacrifices were offered by their priesthood*; whereas Jesus was executed by their soldiery. And, fourthly, it may be objected that, whereas the few human victims that were offered in Rome were *buried alive*,§ Jesus, on the contrary, suffered death *upon a cross*, a species of punishment inflicted by the Romans, only upon slaves, robbers, assassins, and those who were adjudged guilty of sedition:|| and we know, for the evangelists inform us, that this was the crime for which our Lord was tried and, however improperly, condemned.—Was he, then, offered as a sacrifice by the Romans?

* Livii Hist. lib. xiii.

† Gallus et Galla, Græcus et Græca, in foro Boario, sub terra vivi demissi sunt, in locum saxo conceptum, ibi ante, hostiis humanis minime Romano sacro, imbutum"—(*ut supra*.)

‡ See the speech of Cn. Metellus before the Senate, in regard to the Galli, in Asia. Livii Hist. lib. xxxviii.

§ Jahn, Arch. Bib. § 404.

|| Jahn, Arch. Bib. § 261. ibi laudata.

2. Was he offered, as a sacrifice, by the *Jews*? To the idea that he was, the first objection which we have to offer is, that there is no evidence in the scriptures that, in procuring his death, they had any *intent* to offer him as a sacrifice. And we must remember that a sacrificial intent is as indispensable, in order to constitute any thing a literal sacrifice, as an intent to pray, is to render any address a prayer. And secondly we object they could not have intended to offer Jesus as a sacrifice, for the following reasons. 1. The only sacrifices which the Jews ever did, or ever could offer, in the land of Canaan, without committing a crime that was construed into treason, and capitally punished as such, were those which were *expressly appointed in the Mosaic law*. That law not only does not permit human sacrifices, but it repeatedly forbids them;* and abounds with the most fearful denunciations against them. 2. All the bloody or animal sacrifices which were required or allowed by Moses, were either *piacular*, such as were offered in expiation of trespasses, or sins; or *eucharistical*, such as were offered as testimonials of gratitude. All these must be *animals* of certain kinds, distinctly specified. With these facts before our eyes, it is a needless waste of labor to prove that our Lord could not have been regarded by the Jews as a literal sacrifice, either eucharistical, or piacular:—either as an expression of gratitude, or as an atonement for sin.—3. A third reason why the Jews could not have considered Jesus as a

* Levit. xviii. 21. Deut. xviii. 10. 2 Kings xvii. 17, 18. Ps. cvi. 37, 38. 40. Deut. xii. 31.—If then, Jesus *had* been offered by the Jews, *animo sacrificandi*, with the most sacrificial intent, the offering would have been a capital crime by their law, and, of course, not an acceptable sacrifice with God, who gave their law; for he accepts no sacrifice of which the very offering is guilty. To even a heathen moralist it was obvious “*nullam scelere religionem exsolvi* :”—that no religious duty is discharged by the perpetration of a crime. Livii Hist. lib. ii.

sacrifice, of any kind, is that, from before the entrance of the Israelites into the land of Canaan, they were strictly and repeatedly forbidden, under penalty of excision, to offer any sacrifices whatever, except in such place as the Lord should appoint for that purpose.* Before the building of the temple, the place of sacrifice seems not to have been permanently fixed; but the altar was raised whenever the tabernacle stood, or wherever the ark of the Covenant, which was the great sanctuary of the Israelitish religion, happened to rest.† The object of this law, from which there was no exception, except that a prophet had authority to dispense with it,‡ was to guard the worshippers, and even the priests of Jehovah, from all temptation and all opportunity of relapsing into the idolatry by which they were surrounded, and to which they were so propense. This law was, it is true, often violated by wicked monarchs before, and even after, the building of the temple. It was occasionally violated even down to the time of the transportation into Babylon; and, indeed, the transgression of this law was the principal cause of the transportation. But, after the return of the Jews from Babylon, they observed that law so faithfully, that not an instance of its violation in Judea§ can be shewn till the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. And it is owing to the destruction of the temple and altar in Jerusalem, that all Jewish sacrifices have ever since been suspended. From the return of the Jews from Babylon to this moment, the offering of a sacrifice, of any kind, in any other place than the altar and Temple in Jerusalem, would have

* Levit. xvii. 1—9, especially verses 8, 9. Deut. xii. 5—28. Levit. xxvi. 30.

† Vide Michaelis, Mos. Law, § 188. Jahn Arch. Bib. § 376.

‡ 1 Sam. xiii. 8—14. xvi. 1—5. 1 Kings xviii. 21—40.

§ The case of Onias, in Egypt, (Joseph. Ant. Jud. xiii. 3. § 3. Michaelis Mos. Law, § 188.) could hardly be considered as an exception, had the observation been general. But it is no exception, restricted, as the statement is, to Judea.

appeared to them as an inexpressible offence, the most shocking of all abominations. But Jesus "suffered without the gate."*

Again, 4. As with the Romans, so it was, especially after the captivity, with the Jews: all their bloody sacrifices must be offered *by the hands of their own priesthood*.† The interference of strangers, and especially of their enemies, with the offering of their sacrifices, would have been regarded by the Jews with the utmost horror. Yet Jesus died by the hands of the idolatrous Romans, and the Jews were clamorous that he *might* die by their hands. Did they, then, consider him as a sacrifice? *Could* they have so considered him? If in any sense, it can be said that Jesus was sacrificed by the Jews, it can be only in a figurative sense. It may be said that they sacrificed him to their envy, to one of the most bitter and malignant of their own passions; but not to the God of their fathers, the God of holiness and mercy, either as an expression of their gratitude or as an expiation of their sins.

3.—Did Jesus, then, sacrifice *himself*?—It will not be denied that, as, at one time, it might be said that the Jews sacrificed our Lord to their envy, so, at another, it may be said, that he sacrificed himself upon the altar of his duty, or of benevolence, or of pity to the human race. But this is figurative language: and by it we mean that he devoted himself, gave up his life, rather than abandon the arduous and painful offices which he had been commissioned to fill;—the offices of our Teacher, example, and Savior. But this metaphorical sacrifice is the result of a *metaphorical* construction of the passages under consideration. A literal construction of those passages makes the Savior not only a literal sacrifice, but the greatest of all literal sacrifices. As such, we now ask, did he offer himself?

* Heb. xiii. 12.

† Jahn Aroh. Bib. † 378.

To the idea that he did, it may be objected, 1. That he never told his disciples that he intended to offer himself, he never gave them to understand that he considered himself as a sacrifice. On the contrary, he did tell his disciples that he came, among other things, to give his life, not a sacrifice, but a ransom for many. On this fact we have something more, to offer shortly. 2. We may object to the supposition that Jesus offered himself as a literal sacrifice to God, in any sense, the known fact, to which all the evangelists testify, that he did not offer himself at all. While he did not shun death, if it lay where duty led him, he did not seek it. He was followed, arrested, led away to trial and to death. He did not court danger, but rather sought to avoid it.—When we see the Roman Curtius* voluntarily leaping into a gulf to appease the offended gods of his country and his worship;—or the two Decii, father and son,† after deliberately devoting themselves as victims, and, as such, receiving consecration from the priesthood, voluntarily rush into the thickest ranks of their enemies, and fall by their swords, we say that *here* are men who offer themselves a sacrifice to their country and its gods. We admire their patriotism; and, while we lament their superstition, we give them credit for a lofty, tho perhaps, misguided, devotion. But how different from the conduct of these men was that of Jesus of Nazareth! They voluntarily plunged into the abyss, that they might be destroyed. He cast himself upon the current of his duty, and was borne on by that. They sought death. He merely did not shrink from it, when called by duty to meet it. They actively gave themselves to the destruction which they might have escaped. He passively, though magnanimously, submitted to that which appeared inevitable. So far from courting his sufferings and seeking death, his prayer to his heavenly Father was reiterat-

* Liv. Hist. lib. vii.

† Id. lib. viii. x.

ed and earnest, that, if it were possible, the cup which was preparing for him might pass from him. How then can it be said that Jesus offered *himself* to God as a literal sacrifice of any kind?—And if it is a fact, that he did not offer himself,—if it is a fact that neither the Romans nor the Jews offered him—as a sacrifice, by whom was he so offered?—Is not the literal construction of the sacrificial language relating to him, contradicted by so many known facts, that we ought to hesitate before we adopt it?

Thirdly. Do not many of the texts in which Jesus is spoken of as a sacrifice, when literally construed, contradict *each other*, no less than other scriptures, and known facts?—"Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a *body* hast thou prepared me."* For what? A *sacrifice*! to be made an *offering*!—Again; we have just remarked that altho Jesus never spoke of himself as a *sacrifice*, yet he did tell his disciples that he came to give his life a *ransom* for many.† Now, tho, in the metaphorical use of language, we may say, of the same thing, now, that it is a sacrifice, and now a ransom, we are not allowed that license when we are using language in its literal sense. Strictly speaking, a sacrifice is one thing, and a ransom is another, so different that one can neither be used nor mistaken for the other. If, then, the body, or the blood, or the life of Jesus was, either strictly or figuratively, a *ransom*,—as he declares that it was, either strictly or figuratively,—it could not have been a literal *sacrifice*.

Again.—Does the writer to the Hebrews,‡ in one of the texts quoted at the beginning of this article, say, "This man, after that he had once offered a *sacrifice* for sins?" Paul, in another of these texts, says, "for even Christ, our *passover*, is sacrificed for us."§ We have already seen that all bloody sacrifices under the

* Heb. x. 5.

† Heb. x. 12.

‡ Matt. xx. 28.

§ 1 Cor. v. 7.

Mosaic law, the only sacrifices in Judea that were not idolatrous, were either *piacular* or *eucharistical*. All sacrifices for sins were *piacular*. The *passover* however was *eucharistical*.* The literal construction of one of these texts makes Jesus a *piacular* sacrifice, an offering made as an expiation or atonement for sin. The literal construction of another makes him an *eucharistical* sacrifice. But if he be, either, strictly or metaphorically, as one text represents him, an *eucharistical* sacrifice, an acknowledgment of divine mercy,—he cannot be as the letter of another would seem to make him, a *piacular* sacrifice,—a satisfaction of divine justice.

Once more; "This, says our Lord, is my blood of the New Covenant."†—By this we are probably to understand that the blood or death of Jesus was the ratification, sanction, or seal,—the evidence or surety,—of that New Covenant of which he was the Mediator. But the animal that was slain or sacrificed, among all Oriental nations, in ratification of a Covenant, was never considered as a *piacular*, but always as an *eucharistical* sacrifice.‡ They were not indeed exclusively sacrifices of thanksgiving, as were some others: but they were directly opposed to expiatory offerings. If Jesus therefore, was literally a sacrifice of either of these three kinds,—*federal*, a sacrifice in ratification of a covenant;—*paschal*, an offering made at the passover;—or *piacular*, a sacrifice for sins;—he could not have been either of the other two. If he was a *paschal*; he could have been neither a *piacular* nor a *federal* sacrifice: if a *piacular*; neither a *federal* nor *paschal*: if a *federal*; neither a *paschal* nor a *piacular*. But a literal construction of the passages in question, makes him either or all of them indifferently. Is not

* "Ad recolenda majora beneficia divina instituta erant festa paschatis, pentecostis, et tabernaculorum."—Jahn, Arch. Bib. † 353. Vide et † 354.

† Matt. xxvi. 28.

‡ Jahn Arch. Bib. † 383. supported by Exod. xxiv. 4–8.

this alone sufficient proof that he was literally neither? Is it not sufficient proof that a metaphorical construction of these texts must be adopted, since a literal construction arrays them in such direct contradiction to each other, to the plain declarations of God in other parts of the scriptures, and to known incontrovertible facts?

Before answering these questions affirmatively, we ought perhaps to pause, and ask ourselves whether it is according to the authorized usages of language to give a figurative interpretation to expressions so direct, and apparently so plain, as the sacred writers use in most of the texts which we are considering. This is undoubtedly a proper inquiry, and it ought to be faithfully pursued. At the same time, however, we ought to look back upon the ground that we have already gone over, and seriously consider that, having shewn that a literal interpretation of the texts in question makes them directly contradictory to other passages of scripture,—to known facts—and to themselves;—no other alternative now remains to us than either to give them a figurative construction, or to reject them as false, because thus contradictory.

Bearing this consideration in mind, then, do we not find expressions similar to many of these in question, in ordinary use, in our own times, in the frigid zone of an occidental and modern language? We say, of the intemperate man, that he *gives himself up* to his appetites; of the sensualist, that he *sacrifices himself* upon the altar of his passions: and by this we mean that they abandon themselves respectively to vicious indulgences tho their vices are their destruction. The parent *suffers for his children*. The patriot, with a generous devotion, *gives himself up as a sacrifice* to his country, when he endangers and loses his all—his life itself, in its defence. But by this language no one understands that the parent, or patriot, literally offers himself as a propitiatory sacrifice for his family or his country. Civil liberty is secured, even in its best

estate, by the *sacrifice* of our natural rights. The great cause of philanthropy is served only by the philanthropist's *taking upon himself* a part of the *sufferings* of those whom he travels and toils and watches to bless.—Yet, by the use of such language, nobody is led into the belief of a literal sacrifice, or a literal vicarious suffering. As we go back into the depths of antiquity we find, in writers of the highest authority, language still more bold, though of the same general character. Says Cicero, speaking of his efforts and privations in saving his country from the conspiracy of Catiline,—“In this season of your alarm I have passed over many things in silence: I have made many concessions: I have undergone much: *I have healed many of the public maladies*, as it were *by my own sufferings*.”* Again, “If the consulship be granted me only on this condition, that I endure every kind of affliction, and pain, and even torture, I will bear them not only with fortitude but cheerfully, provided that *by my sufferings I may secure the dignity and salvation of yourselves and of Rome*.”† How far is this language below Isaiah's: “The chastisement of our peace was upon him; and by his stripes we are healed.”‡

Josephus, an author of the same nation, and nearly of the same age, with the writers of the New Testament, uses language in relation to the fortitude shown by the Maccabees, under their tortures, and the benefits derived to Israel from their sufferings, which equals, if it does not transcend, the strongest expressions of substitution and expiatory suffering used by

* “Ego multa tacui, multa pertuli, multa concessi, multa meo quodam dolore, in vestro timore, sanavi.”—*Cic. Orat. iv. in Catilinam. Vide Cleric. in Esai. liii. 5.*

† Mihi, si hæc conditio Consulatus data est, ut omnes acerbitates omnes dolores, cruciatusque perferrem; seram, non solum fortiter, sed etiam libenter, dummodo meis laboribus vobis populoque Romano dignitas salusque pariat. — *Cicero, ap. Cleric. ut supra.*

‡ Isai. liii. 5.

the sacred writers in speaking of our Lord. After his long account of their firmness and their death, under the tortures inflicted by command of Antiochus, he says: "These men, therefore, having been sanctified of God, have attained this glory—(of standing by the throne of God and enjoying a happy eternity)—and not this glory only; but it was through them, having become, as it were, *the ransom of a sinful people*, that the enemies of our nation were defeated,—the tyrant punished—and the dishonour of our country wiped away:—and, *by the blood of these pious men, and the propitiation of their death*, divine Providence effected the salvation of oppressed Israel."* This last example of the figurative use of sacrificial language, being from a Jewish writer, who is speaking of men that devoted themselves upon the altar of their religion and their country, is particularly illustrative of the language of other Jewish writers when speaking of one who also devoted himself to dishonor and death for the benefit of his brethren; and who also, having been sanctified by the Father,† was, in consideration of his obedience unto death, highly exalted by him,‡ and crowned with glory and honor.§ But we need not go abroad for examples of the use of sacrificial language in relation to men and things, to the full as bold and as strong as the sacred writers use in relation to Christ. The sacred writers themselves, especially those of them who most frequently use this language in respect to Christ, use it not less frequently in connexion with other subjects; and that, too, without ever having been understood as speaking literally.

Does Peter say that "*Christ suffered for us?*"|| He suffered in such a sense that "*we also may follow his steps.*" But, if he suffered as a literal sacrifice to God; as an expiation for sin, does it not follow that

* Vide Josephus "De Maccabæis," † 17.—Vide et 2 Maccab. vii. 37, 38: in the LXX.

† John x. 36.

‡ Phil. ii. 8. 9.

§ Heb. ii. 9.

|| 1 Pet. ii. 21.

we must suffer for others as a sin offering—that the servants to whom these words are addressed, should suffer as a sacrifice to God for their masters' sins? Did *Christ* “become poor, or live in poverty, for our sake?”* Paul, also, “endured all things for the elect’s sake that they also might obtain salvation.”† Can a stronger text be produced, from the New Testament, to prove that *Christ* was delivered to death for our sake, than this of Paul, to a very different purpose: “For we, who live, are always delivered unto death for *Jesus’ sake*.”‡ Did Christ suffer in our behalf, or for our sake? Paul says to the Philippians, “unto you it is given, in behalf of *Christ*, not only to believe in him, but to suffer for his sake.” Does he say to the Christians at Ephesus that “*Christ* hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God?”§ To those at Rome|| he says, “I beseech you, therefore, by the mercies of God, that ye present *your bodies a living sacrifice*, holy, acceptable unto God.” To the Philippians he says,¶ “If I be offered upon the sacrifice of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all:” and to Timothy he says, when he feels that his labors must soon close, “I am now ready to be offered,” or more correctly, *I am already poured out as an offering*.** What is meant, by this language, but that the aged apostle was exhausted, that he had worn himself out, in the discharge of the duties of the office to which he had been called of God? Can we suppose that Paul considered himself as a literal sacrifice? that he presented himself, or besought the Roman Christians to present themselves to God, as a propitiatory offering? If not, why should we not give a metaphorical construction to similar, but not stronger language, in relation to Christ; who also fell a victim,—a nobler and a spotless victim,—to the cause that had been

* 2 Cor. viii. 9.

† 2 Tim. ii. 10.

‡ 2 Cor. iv. 2.

§ Eph. v. 2.

|| Rom. xii. 1.

¶ Phil. ii. 17.

** 2 Tim. iv. 6.

committed to him?—Paul was the minister of Christ unto the Gentiles, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the same Holy Spirit.* Has Christ *given himself for us a sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling savor*?† The charity, which the Philippians sent by Epaphroditus to Paul, was an odor of sweet smell, a sacrifice, acceptable, well pleasing unto God.‡ Were the Gentiles offered as a literal sacrifice to God? Do we give a strict construction to that language, which calls the charitable contributions of Christians to each other a sacrifice? If not, it is according to the usages of language, and especially of the language of the New Testament, to apply to persons and things indifferently, and in a figurative sense, the language which was strictly applicable to the proper sacrifices of the Mosaic law.

In as much, then, as the sacrificial language of the New Testament when applied to all persons *may be*, and applied to all except Jesus *must be*, understood figuratively; it certainly *may be* so understood when applied to him. And, in as much as a literal construction of that language in the several texts where he is the subject of discourse, would make those texts contradictory to other passages of scripture, to facts, and to themselves, we conclude that the metaphorical sense must be adopted.

Or shall we, disregarding the opposition of these texts when literally construed to each other, to plain declarations of scripture and to multiplied scriptural as well as other historical facts—shall we still insist upon construing them literally? and, giving up our reason and our faith to the consequences of such a construction, shall we believe, as the letter would compel us to believe, that our Lord was not only a real sacrifice, but every sort of sacrifice?—that he is now, a *federal* or testamentary sacrifice,§ whose blood

* Rom. xv. 16.

† Eph. v. 2.

‡ Phil. iv. 18.

§ Matt. xxvi. 28. Mark xiv. 24. Luke xxii. 20. 1 Cor. xi. 24.

is to ratify a covenant: now, a *piacular* offering, whose blood is to make an atonement for sin:* and now, a *passover*, to commemorate our deliverance from sin and death? Shall we believe now, that he *was* offered,† and now that he offered up‡ or sacrificed§ *himself*? Shall we believe that he is now the offering, and now the priest who makes the offering?¶ If we are prepared to plunge into depths of belief like these, looking to the letter as the only guide of our faith, what shall restrain us from going on, and believing that Jesus is a *vine*,¶ and a *way*,** and a *door*,†† and a *corner-stone*;‡‡ and all this, at the same time that he is a *shepherd*§§ and a *lion*||| and the bright and morning *star*?¶¶ Are we prepared to adopt a system of construing the scriptures which shall lead us into such gross inconsistencies? and shall we delude ourselves with the idea that these are the deep things of God? Shall we follow the letter, when it will compel us to believe that our Lord has assumed so many different forms, and that he acted and suffered in so many inconsistent characters, at the moment when, on the same principle, we are required to believe that Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever?***

Shall we not rather believe that, in much of what the early disciples of Jesus said of him, they spoke, as all orientals speak, in a highly figurative style? Regarding him as the greatest of the prophets, and the most illustrious of the teachers who had come from God, was it wonderful that they should apply to him every title of dignity and glory? Recently converted, as they had been, from a religion abounding in sacrifices, was it not natural for them, especially when addressing those who had been educated in the same religion, to speak of their new faith in terms which had

* 1 Pet. ii. 24. 2 Cor. v. 21. Eph. v. 2.

† Heb. ix. 28.

‡ Heb. ix. 14.

§ Heb. ix. 26.

¶ Heb. ix. 11.

¶ John xv. 1.

** John xiv. 6.

†† John x. i. 7. 9.

‡‡ Eph. ii. 20. 1 Peter ii. 6.

§§ John x. 11.

||| Rev. v. 5.

¶¶ Rev. ii. 28.

*** Heb. xiii. 8.

been familiar to them from their childhood? Admiring, as they did, the virtues of their Lord, and deeply affected, as they must have been, by the sufferings by which those virtues were called forth and proved; their feelings must have been excited, whenever he was the subject of their thoughts or their discourse, to more than their ordinary warmth, and to a neglect of the cold and studied correctness of the careful rhetorician. When they considered that their master had fallen a victim to his own fidelity, and to the envy of others, what was more natural than that they should speak of him as a sacrifice?—a sacrifice, now of one kind and now of another, according to their own circumstances at the time they were speaking, or to the other subjects of their discourse, or to the particular benefit which had resulted to the world from what he had done or suffered? When, either in prophetic vision, or in a rational anticipation of what must be effected by the religion of Jesus, they looked forward to the ultimate reformation of mankind—to the dispelling of the darkness of ignorance and sin from the face of the earth, what more natural than that they should call him “the lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world?” If the new covenant is sealed or ratified by his death, his is “the blood of the covenant,” and the gospel itself is “the new covenant in his blood.” If an apostle is comparing the new converts to a mass of unleavened bread, this bread, being eaten at the passover, brings that festival to his mind; but Christ was crucified on the eve of the feast of unleavened bread; and then “Christ is himself our passover who was sacrificed for us.”

The same kind of construction will guide us in other similar passages, and enable us to preserve, unimpeached, the best faculties of our nature, our reverence for the sacred oracles, and, above all, the adorable excellence of the divine character. It will enable us more correctly to understand the documents of our religion, more gratefully to rejoice in the light which

they shed upon our path here, and upon our prospects hereafter, and more readily to convert to our spiritual nourishment and strength, the bread of life which came down from heaven in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

DISSERTATION ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT. NO. V.

It has become a common saying among us, that man will be punished as long as he is a sinner, and no longer. The proposition, no doubt, is a good one; but the inferences usually drawn from it, we conceive to be fallacious. We find it pressed upon us, with no small degree of confidence on the part of our opposing brethren, that when man ceases to commit sin, he ceases to be a sinner, and as he is not supposed to commit sin in a future state, he is not thought to be a sinner, and of course not considered a proper subject of punishment. We are willing to grant there is something plausible in all this; but we are prepared to say there is as much fallacy in the position, as there is plausibility.

With a view to direct our inquiries to this point, let us consider what constitutes any one *a sinner*.—We read that “sin is the transgression of the law.” *He* who commits sin, then, transgresses the law, and by it is condemned as a sinner. An inquiry which is now essential to the subject in discussion, is whether a man is *a sinner*, only while in the *actual* commission of sin. If this is the case, we confess we are in the wrong; but if not, our ground is tenable.—Here permit us first, to introduce an argument from the pen of an opposer on this subject, expressed in the following words:

“That I’m *a sinner*, Lord, I own;
But thou in mercy gave thy Son
For wretches such as me.”

We are at liberty to take for granted, that the writer of these lines, in making this confession, did make

a good one, and consequently did not *commit* sin in doing it ; notwithstanding according to the confession he was a *sinner*, *when* it appears he did not *commit* sin. The inferences from this position appear irresistible. And as these lines were composed for general use, it establishes the universality of the application from the mouth of an opposing brother, that a man may be a sinner *when* he is not in actual commission of sin.

Let us now take a more general view of the question. Does the thief cease to be a thief, because he is confined in a prison and cannot steal ? Does the robber cease to be such, because he wants opportunity ? or the murderer, merely because he survives the last act of slaying his fellow-being ? The answer to all these questions is plain, and goes clearly to show that a man's character may outlive the actual perpetration of his deeds. In fact the moral influence of every labor is consequent to the labor itself. "The wages of sin is death."

To the point under consideration, let us here introduce the case of Joseph's brethren. Should we suppose the remorse of conscience to be the proper punishment of sin, which idea well coincides with the views of our opposers, we have here an instance of its duration far beyond the period of the perpetration of their crimes. After their father Jacob was dead, and one might suppose the whole matter was put to rest, Joseph's brethren *went and fell down before his face ; and they said, Behold we are thy servants.*

No position appears more evident than the idea that the moral character of a man which takes its rise from his works is not confined in its duration to the actual perpetration of his deeds. The contrary idea destroys every proper ground of civil punishment ; for no civil authority can take cognizance of an act till after it is committed. Of course such authority must punish people, not *in* the act of disobedience, but *for* it ; or it cannot punish them at all. We admit, the laws of

God are not wholly thus confined. They may take cognizance of an act while it is committing ; but they seldom consider him duly punished for it, till some time after its perpetration. The evangelists inform us that Barabbas, whom the Jews desired should be released instead of Jesus, *was a robber*. They give him this character at the time when both he and our Lord were arraigned at the tribunal of Pilate, tho Barabbas was then a prisoner, and no doubt had committed no robbery for considerable time.

The idea of men's being punished in a future state of being for sins committed in this, we find much harped upon in the discourses and writings of those who oppose the doctrine of future punishment. On the relative connexion between a future and the present state, we have already offered a few thoughts. We are willing to admit that if there be no proper and relative connexion between the two states, punishment in a future state, for sins committed in this, would be absurd. But we hope this relative connexion will not be denied.

The term *sin* comprises not only the outward acts so named, but often the poisonous and deadly consequences of moral depravity that commonly follows.— Hence it is very evident that a person must be accounted a sinner, till he shall be cleansed from its moral pollution, altho he should not be always found in the perpetration of crimes. It does not follow then of undeniable consequence, because we do not expect men will rob, cheat, and plunder in a future state, that they are not sinners in such a state. If it be made evident from scripture that men are exposed to punishment in a future state, for sin, as many of us verily believe, it needs something stronger to refute the doctrine, than for a few men to say, it cannot be, because in that state *there can be no sin*.

There is a passage in the Proverbs of Solomon that is much urged against the doctrine of future rewards and punishments. "Behold, the righteous shall be

recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner." Chap. xi. 31. By some it is concluded from this passage that if the righteous be recompensed *in the earth*, they can have no recompense elsewhere; and if the wicked are to be recompensed in the earth, they can have no other recompense, than while they live here. If we add to any of these recompenses, we give them a double recompense. If it be any other than while they are alive on this earth it is a denial of the text. But what can a reward *in the earth* be, except in those things that belong to the earth? Not any thing, say they. What shall we then say of the words of Christ? "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you. . . ! . . . Rejoice and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward *in heaven*; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." Matt. v. 11, 12.—The proverbs of Solomon were designed for general maxims of human life. They have seldom any reference to a future state, either of happiness or misery. We have no reason to believe they were designed to teach us the principles of christianity, any further than those principles are embraced in the course of human actions here. As far as the design of their application extends, they are undoubtedly true, but fall much short of embracing a complete account of the divine economy in relation to man. We have reason to believe the above text quoted from Proverbs, has been pressed into a service where it did not belong, and not only so, but made to occupy a very important ground in that service.

A passage in the New Testament made to occupy a very prominent part in this controversy, is found in Rom. vi. 7. "For he that is dead is freed from sin." It would seem that the apostle was sufficiently plain in the use of this passage to be clearly understood. In the 2d verse of this chapter, he asks, "how shall we that are *dead to sin* live any longer therein?" *A deadness to sin* was the subject of his writing. Again, in the 6th verse, "Knowing this, that our old man is cri-

cified with him that the *body of sin might be destroyed*, that henceforth we should not serve sin." Altho Christ's death and resurrection in connexion with ours are a literal death and resurrection as described in this chapter of the *apostle's*; yet our death as the effect of his is so plainly pointed out, as to make it evident that this deadness is a deadness to sin and not a deadness to the natural body, as our opposers strenuously contend.

Having offered to a generous and enlightened public these few arguments in support of a future retribution, we think we shall continue these series of numbers on future punishment no further. We had calculated to have offered something on its superior advantage in point of moral tendency, in another number, which may be done some future day, should occasion require. It may be, that the Lord will now visit us with peace; and we wish to show our brethren and the world every possible mark of conciliation and accommodation. Tho we would not flatter them that we are disposed to relinquish any proper right in faith or practice, we would use all possible means to live peaceably with all men. Whenever our opposers are disposed to submit this subject to an enlightened public, and perhaps they now are, without further labor, we have no disposition to keep alive the controversy.

PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE IN FAVOR OF UNIVERSAL
SALVATION. NO. 2.

Exodus xx. 5, 6. "For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments."

Psalms xxx. 5. "For his anger endureth but a moment; in his favor is life: weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning."

Psalm ciii. 8; 9. "The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide; neither will he keep his anger forever."

Jer. iii. 12. "For I am merciful, saith the Lord, and I will not keep anger forever."

Lamen. iii. 31, 32, 33. "For the Lord will not cast off forever; but tho he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies. For he doth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men."

Ezekiel xvi. 42. "So will I make my fury toward thee to rest, and my jealousy shall depart from thee, and I will be quiet, and will be no more angry."

REMARKS.

The above passages borrow much of their phraseology from the actions and passions of men. Such expressions as, *my fury, my jealousy, I will be quiet, &c.* we are not to understand as literally true of God, as we understand them when applied to man. They express analogous ideas, so far as is consistent with the divine perfections.

We find the above passages much in favor of universal salvation from the idea that they all represent mercy as superabundant. The following remarks on the first passage are taken from the Commentary of Dr. Adam Clarke.

"Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children. This necessarily implies—if the children walk in the steps of their fathers. For no man can be condemned by divine justice for a crime of which he was never guilty, see Ezek. xviii. Idolatry is however particularly intended; and *visiting* sins of this kind, refers principally to *national judgements*. By withdrawing the divine protection, the idolatrous Israelites were delivered up into the hands of their enemies, from whom, the gods in whom they trusted, could not deliver them. This, God did to the *third and fourth generation*, i. e. *successively*; as may be seen in every

part of the Jewish history, and particularly in the book of *Judges*. And this, at last, because the grand, and the only effectual and lasting means, in his hand, of their final deliverance from idolatry; for it is well known that after the Babylonish captivity, the Israelites were so completely saved from idolatry, as never to have disgraced themselves by it, as they had formerly done. These national judgements thus continued from generation to generation, appear to be what are designed by the words in the text, *visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children, &c.*

"Verse 6. *And shewing mercy unto thousands.* Mark: even those who love God, and keep his commandments, *merit* nothing from him; and therefore the salvation and blessedness which these enjoy, come from the mercy of God. *Shewing mercy, &c.* What a disproportion between the works of *justice* and *mercy*! *Justice* works to the *third* or *fourth*, *mercy* to *thousands* of generations."

One of the aforementioned texts says, "the Lord will not keep anger forever." What is this but saying his judgements or punishments will come to an end: We repeat, whatever his anger, or the afflictions thereby occasioned may be, his mercy is superabundant, and prevails in the end. "Ye have heard of the patience of Job," says a divine writer, "and seen the *end* of the Lord, that the Lord is very pitiful and of tender mercy."

For the Christian Repository.

MR. EDITOR,

By admitting the following statements in your periodical publication you will much oblige your friend.

For some years past, I have been a member of the Calvinistic Baptist Church in Sutton, N. H. but in consequence of a difficulty between myself and Elder Nathan Ames, the present pastor of that Church, concerning the upsetting of a Mr. Fifield's beehive, the Church have severed me from their communion by

excommunication, and, as I conceive, wrongfully. In the upsetting of the aforementioned beehive, there were certain persons implicated, among whom was my son. Others concluded it was upset by bugs. In consequence of contradictory statements made by Elder Ames, as I regret to have occasion to say, I believe Elder Ames and the Church found themselves in difficulty, and have taken the course they have, tending so much to the injury of my character. I have hitherto sought for redress of grievances, and sought in vain. As the last resort, I would hereby inform my brethren and the public, when all other means of a proper adjustment of these difficulties fail, I have fully concluded to lay these transactions before the public, with suitable testimony to vindicate my injured character. It is my sincere wish that these difficulties may be settled in a gospel manner; and I trust I stand ready to acknowledge my faults, so far as I am convinced of them, in the light of the understanding which my benevolent Creator has given me.

EZEKIEL LITTLE.

EXTRACT FROM THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE NORTHERN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSALISTS.

The members of the Northern Association of Universalists met in Council, according to appointment, at the house of Mr. JOSIAH SIMONDS, in Whiting, County of Addison, Vermont, on Tuesday evening, the last of September, 1823; and after uniting in solemn and devout prayer with Br. Loveland, organized by choosing,

Br. S. C. LOVELAND, *Moderator.*

Br. R. BARTLETT, *Clerk.*

Br. D. SKINNER, *Assistant Clerk.*

Appointed BRS. J. BABBIT, A. KINSMAN, and S. C. LOVELAND, a Committee, to receive requests for letters of fellowship, or ordination, if any there be.

Adjourned till 8 o'clock, Wednesday Morning.

Prayer by Br. R. Bartlett.

Wednesday Morning, met and opened the business of the Council, by uniting in prayer with Br. A. Priest.

Proceeded to read the letters from the several Churches and Societies in fellowship with this Association, and found them expressing good tidings good.

Order of Public Service for Wednesday.

MORNING SERVICE.

Introductory prayer, by Br. R. Bartlett.

Sermon, Br. D. Skinner. Text, Genesis xxviii. 12. "And he dreamed, and behold, a ladder set upon the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and, behold, the angels of God ascending and descending on it."

Concluding prayer, Br. A. Priest.

AFTERNOON SERVICE.

Introductory prayer by Br. L. Willis.

Sermon, Br. S. C. Loveland. Text, Matt. xxii. 37, 38, 39. "Jesus said unto him, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Concluding prayer, Br. C. R. Marsh.

EVENING SERVICE.

Introductory prayer, Br. S. C. Loveland.

Sermon, Br. L. Willis. Text, Deut. xxxiii. 16, 17. "Let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph, and upon the top of the head of him that was separated from his brethren. His glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns are like the horns of unicorns: with them he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth: and they are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and they are the thousands of Manasseh."

Concluding prayer, Br. J. Babbit.

Attended to the report of ministering brethren, appointed last year to visit and represent the present state of the Churches and Societies belonging to this Association, who gave us joyful and refreshing tidings.

Adjourned till 8 o'clock, Thursday.

Thursday morning—met according to adjournment and opened the business of the council, by uniting in solemn and devout prayer with Br. R. Bartlett.

Attended to a report of the committee appointed to receive requests for letters of fellowship, and ordination, who reported in favor of ordaining Brs. Asa Priest, Dolphus Skinner, Lemuel Willis, and Charles R. Marsh.

This report was accepted.

Arrangement of the Public Exercises for Thursday.

MORNING SERVICE.

Introductory prayer by Br. D. Skinner.

Sermon by Br. A. Kinsman. Text, Matthew x. 7. "And, as ye go, preach."

Concluding prayer by Br. L. Willis.

AFTERNOON SERVICE.

Introductory prayer by Br. S. C. Loveland.

Sermon by Br. R. Bartlett. Text, James iii. 17. "But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy."

Consecrating prayer by Br. J. Babbit.

Delivery of the Scriptures and charge by Br. S. C. Loveland.

Right hand of fellowship by Br. A. Kinsman.

Concluding prayer by Br. R. Bartlett.

Attended on the report of a committee from the General Convention.

Adjourned the Association to meet at Whitehall, (N. Y.) on the first Wednesday and Thursday in October, 1824.

Prayer by Br. L. Willis.

SAMUEL C. LOVELAND, *Moderator.*ROBERT BARTLETT, *Clerk.*DOLPHUS SKINNER, *Assistant Clerk.*

MISCELLANEOUS.

The sermons contained in this volume are from the pen of Br. Edward Turner, except the one in the first number. We trust they will be read with interest and satisfaction.

Mr. Ezekiel Little, whose notice to his once Baptist brethren is inserted in this number, has been a member of the church from which he has been excommunicated, for some years; and with good reputation has sustained both offices of *deacon* and *clerk* of that church. We have only to say further, we hope the wrong, in this matter, will fall where it ought, and an amicable settlement follow.

This number brings us to the close of the present volume. To the patronizers of this work, the Editor

tenders his respects, and still solicits a further continuance of their favors. * Those agents (for those are considered such to whom the bundles have been directed) who wish to discontinue their agency, will please to ~~dis~~urge others, and seasonably inform us at our office.

Obituary.

Died, in Plymouth, June 3, 1820, Mrs. MARY BOYNTON, wife of Deacon Amos Boynton, in the 77th year of her age. November 15th, 1820, Deacon AMOS BOYNTON, in his 79th year. Deacon Boynton was, for many years, a member of the Congregational Church in Plymouth, in which he officiated as Deacon. He ever sustained a good reputation as a religious and moral man, and was scrupulously exact in the performance of religious duties, according to the rules of life embraced by our fathers. At the time of the excommunication of his son, Isaiah Boynton Esq., the account of which is contained in the first number of the third volume of the Christian Repository, he withdrew from the Church. We know not that he ever fully embraced our views of universal salvation; but seemed to be one that desired to see the day of Christ, and ready to rejoice at the universal spread of gospel light and truth.

In the same town, Jan. 16, Widow MOLLY PAGE, in the 73d year of her age.

At Weston, Jan. 7, Mr. GIDEON PEASE, in the 67th year of his age. He was a brother in the faith of that gospel, which some are pleased to term *damnable heresy*, and persevered faithfully "unto death." "The righteous hath hope in his death."

In Caldwell, N.Y. Feb. 7, Mrs. CATY McFARLAND, aged 79. —Feb. 24, her husband, Mr. JOSEPH McFARLAND, aged 75. They had lived together 54 years. They were ardent in their tokens of sincere affection. A few moments before Mrs. McFarland expired, she called her husband to her, and embracing him with her dying lips, bid him, *farewell*. The kiss of affection he returned after her decease. About an hour before his departure, he bowed on his knees, and prayed to the Father of spirits, he might be delivered from this world of pain and grief, and that his spirit might unite with that of his departed friend, and the spirits of just men made perfect. He was a firm believer in God's unbounded grace and impartial goodness to all men, and rejoiced in the same at the hour of death.

In Reading, March 22, Mrs. MIMA FAY, wife of Mr. Thomas Fay, aged 72.

The following lines were written by Miss Minerva Mayo, of Orange, Mass. a few days before her death, which took place June 9, 1822.

WHAT'S THIS WORLD TO ME ?

I view the earth with all its sweets,
I see each verdant tree,
I see the sun send forth its heats ;
But what's this world to me ?

'Tis but a dream of discontent,
When hope has turn'd the key,
And left me here now to lament,
And what's this world to me ?

I soon shall gain the hopeful prize,
Refin'd from vanity,
And with that spirit I shall rise,---
Then what's this world to me ?

'Tis but a shadow in disguise,
To what I soon shall see ;
A home of life beyond the skies
Says, what's this world to me ?

O let me have fair wisdom's wings,
And I will soon be free ;
I'll go and leave all meaner things,
For what's this world to me ?

'Tis nothing in my longing eyes,
It soon from us will flee ;
But there is one that never dies,
And what's this world to me ?

Yon lightning's sharp and whirling power
Bade my faint spirit be
Resign'd, and wait the destin'd hour :
But what's this world to me ?

The hour has come, I'm going home
With him who's paid my fee ;
I do not fear the grave or tomb ;
He's made a home for me.

He's made a home for every soul,
For all that's in the sea ;
And all that death and hell have stole :
Now what's this world to me ?

Acme

**Bookbinding Co., Inc.
300 Summer Street
Boston, Mass. 02210**

